arXiv:1512.01136v1 [math.DS] 3 Dec 2015

THE LIPSCHITZ CONSTANT OF A NONARCHIMEDEAN RATIONAL FUNCTION

ROBERT RUMELY AND STEPHEN WINBURN

Abstract. Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean valued field, and let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. We provide explicit bounds for the Lipschitz constants $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$, $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)$, in terms of algebraic and geometric invariants of φ.

Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean valued field with absolute value $|\cdot|$ and associated valuation $\mathrm{ord}(\cdot)$. Write $\mathcal{O}$ for the ring of integers of K, $\mathcal{O}^\times$ for its group of units, $\mathfrak{m}$ for its maximal ideal, and $\widetilde{k}$ for its residue field.

Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ be a rational function with $\deg(\varphi) = d \geq 1$. The action of φ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ extends canonically to an action on Berkovich projective line $\mathbf{P}^1_K$. In [5] Favre and Rivera-Letelier define a metric $d(x,y)$ on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, which induces the strong topology on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$; if $\|x,y\|$ denotes the spherical metric on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, then $d(x,y)$ restricts to $2\|x,y\|$ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. The Lipschitz constant of φ with respect to $d(x,y)$ is

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;:=\; \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\mathbf{P}^1_K\\ x\neq y}} \frac{d(\varphi(x),\varphi(y))}{d(x,y)}\ .$$

It is the only inexplicit term in Favre and Rivera-Letelier's quantitative equidistribution theorem for dynamical small points ([5], Theorem 7). One may also be interested in the Lipschitz constant of φ on classical points,

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \;:=\; \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\mathbb{P}^1(K)\\ x\neq y}} \frac{\|\varphi(x),\varphi(y)\|}{\|x,y\|}\ .$$

The purpose of this paper is to bound $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ using algebraic and geometric $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$-invariants of φ. Let (F,G) be a *normalized representation* for φ, a pair of homogeneous polynomials $F(X,Y), G(X,Y) \in \mathcal{O}[X,Y]$ of degree d, with at least one coefficient of F or G in $\mathcal{O}^\times$, such that $[F:G]$ gives the action of φ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. The absolute value of the resultant $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)| := |\mathrm{Res}(F,G)|$ is independent of the choice of normalized representation.

Theorem 0.1. *Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean field, and let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \leq \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|}\ , \quad \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \leq \max\Big(\frac{d}{|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|}\,,\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|^d}\Big)\ . \tag{1}$$

Date: December 3, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37P50, 11S82; Secondary 37P05.

Key words and phrases. Lipschitz Constant, Strong metric.

In particular, $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ are uniformly bounded in terms of the proximity of φ to the boundary of the parameter space Rat_d.

We prove Theorem 0.1 by first bounding $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)$ in terms of geometric invariants of φ. Suppose

$$\varphi(z) \;=\; C\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N}(z-\alpha_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^{M}(z-\beta_j)}\;, \tag{2}$$

where $d=\deg(\varphi)=\max(M,N)$.

If the α_i,β_j are fixed but $|C|\to\infty$, then $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi),\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)\to\infty$. We introduce the *Gauss Image Radius* $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$ as a geometric replacement for C: given $x\in\mathbf{P}^1_K$, let $0\le\mathrm{diam}_G(x)\le 1$ be its diameter with respect to the Gauss point ζ_G (see §1), and put

$$\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \;:=\; \mathrm{diam}_G(\varphi(\zeta_G))\;.$$

Likewise, if C is fixed, but a root approaches a pole, then $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi),\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)\to\infty$. Let the Root-Pole number $\mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$ be the minimal spherical distance between a zero and a pole of φ. We introduce the *Ball-Mapping radius* $B_0(\varphi)$ as a geometric replacement for $\mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$: for each $a\in\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and each $0<r\le 1$, let $B(a,r)^-=\{z\in\mathbb{P}^1(K):\|z,a\|<r\}$, and let $\mathcal{B}(a,r)^-$ be the smallest open connected subset of $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ containing $B(a,r)^-$. It is known that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(a,r)^-)$ is either an open ball $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v})^-$, or is all of $\mathbf{P}^1_K$. Define

$$B_0(\varphi) \;:=\; \sup\{\;0<r\le 1\;:\;\text{for all } a\in\mathbb{P}^1(K),\ \varphi(\mathcal{B}(a,r)^-)\text{ is a ball }\}\;.$$

The number $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$ can be readily computed from the coefficients of φ (see Proposition 4.3). We do not know how to determine $B_0(\varphi)$ in general; this seems an interesting problem. By Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.5 one has $B_0(\varphi)\ge\mathrm{RP}(\varphi)\ge|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. In Proposition 4.2 we show that $B_0(\varphi)\in|K^\times|$ and is achieved by some ball $\mathcal{B}(a,r)^-$.

Our main result is

Theorem 0.2. *Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean field, and let $\varphi(z)\in K(z)$ have degree $d\ge 1$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\le\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)\cdot B_0(\varphi)^d}\,,\,\frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d}\cdot B_0(\varphi)}\Big)\;. \tag{3}$$

Combined with the inequality $B_0(\varphi)\ge\mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$, Theorem 0.2 implies the following bounds, which may be useful when a factorization of φ in the form (2) is known:

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\le\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)\cdot \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)^d}\,,\,\frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d}\cdot \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)}\Big) \;\le\; \frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)\cdot\mathrm{RP}(\varphi)^d}\;. \tag{4}$$

The bound in Theorem 0.2 is sharp when $d=1$, that is, when $\varphi(z)$ is a linear fractional transformation (see Theorem 0.4 below). When $d\ge 2$, for each triple $\big(d,\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi),B_0(\varphi)\big)$ we give examples where $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ is within a factor $(d-1)/d$ of the right side of (3) (see §6).

Trivially $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)\le\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$, however, there is an explicit formula for $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)$ which yields a better bound. The set $\varphi^{-1}(\{\zeta_G\})\subset\mathbf{P}^1_K\setminus\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is finite; define the *Gauss Pre-Image radius*

$$\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \;=\; \min_{\varphi(\xi)=\zeta_G}\mathrm{diam}_G(\xi)\;.$$

Theorem 0.3. *Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean field, and let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)}\ .$$

In Corollary 4.5, we show that $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^d \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$, and that $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. Combining this with Theorems 0.2 and 0.3 yields Theorem 0.1.

For a Möbius transformation, the bounds in Theorems 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3 are sharp, and can be made much more explicit:

Theorem 0.4. *Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean field, and let $\varphi(z) = (az+b)/(cz+d) \in K(z)$ have degree 1. Then $B_0(\varphi) = 1$, and*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;&=\; \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)} \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)} \\ &=\; \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|} \;=\; \frac{\max(\,|a|,|b|,|c|,|d|\,)}{|ad-bc|}\ .\end{aligned}$$

The plan of the paper is as follows. In §1 we recall facts and notation concerning the Berkovich projective line. In §2 we establish some preliminary lemmas, showing that to bound $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ it suffices to bound it on a restricted class of segments $[x,y]$. In §3 we prove Theorem 0.4. In §4 we study the constants $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$, $B_0(\varphi)$, $\mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$, and $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$, and we give a formula for $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$ which may be of independent interest. In §5 we prove Theorems 0.1, 0.2 and 0.3. Finally, in §6 we provide examples showing that Theorem 0.2 cannot be significantly improved.

We thank Xander Faber and Kenneth Jacobs for useful discussions. In particular we thank Jacobs for pointing out that Theorem 0.2 could yield bounds of the form (1).

1. The Berkovich Projective Line

The Berkovich projective line over K is a locally ringed space, functorially constructed from $\mathbb{P}^1/K$, whose sheaf of rings comes from rigid analysis and whose underlying point set is gotten by gluing the Gel'fand spectra of those rings (see [3]). We will write $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ for its point set, which is a uniquely path-connected Hausdorff space containing $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. For proofs of the properties of $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ discussed below, see ([1], Chapters 1 and 2); for additional facts about $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, see ([2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [8]).

Berkovich's classification theorem (see ([3], p.18), or ([1], p.5)) provides an elementary model for $\mathbf{P}^1_K$: its points correspond to discs $D(a,r) = \{z \in K : |z-a| \leq r\}$, where $a \in K$ and $0 \leq r \in \mathbb{R}$, or to cofinal equivalence classes of sequences of nested discs with empty intersection, or to the point $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. There are four kinds of points. Type I points, which are the points of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, correspond to degenerate discs of radius 0 in K and the point $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Type II points correspond to discs $D(a,r)$ with r in the value group $|K^\times|$, and type III points correspond to discs $D(a,r)$ with $r \notin |K^\times|$. Type IV points correspond to (cofinal equivalence classes of) sequences of nested discs with empty intersection; they serve to complete $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ but rarely need to be dealt with explicitly: they are usually handled by continuity arguments.

We call $\mathbf{A}^1_K = \mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{\infty\}$ the Berkovich Affine Line.

We write $\zeta_{a,r}$ for the point corresponding to $D(a,r)$. The point $\zeta_G := \zeta_{0,1}$ corresponding to $D(0,1)$ is called the *Gauss point*, and plays a particularly important role.

Paths in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ correspond to ascending or descending chains of discs, or concatenations of such chains sharing an endpoint. For example the path from 0 to 1 in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ corresponds to the concatenation of the chains $\{D(0,r) : 0 \le r \le 1\}$ and $\{D(1,r) : 0 \le r \le 1\}$; here $D(0,1) = D(1,1)$. The point ∞, and type IV points, can also be endpoints of chains. Topologically, $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ is a tree: for any two points $x, y \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$, there is a unique path $[x,y]$ between x and y. We will write (x,y), $[x,y)$, and $(x,y]$ for the corresponding open or half-open paths.

Fix a point $\xi \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$. The fact that $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ is uniquely path connected means that for any two points $x, y \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$, we can define the join $x \vee_\xi y$ to be the first point where the paths $[x,\xi]$ and $[y,\xi]$ meet. We will be particularly interested in the cases where $\xi = \infty$ and $\xi = \zeta_G$; we denote the corresponding joins by $x \vee_\infty y$ and $x \vee_G y$.

The fact that $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ is uniquely path-connected also means that for each $Q \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$, the path-components of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{Q\}$ have the property that for any P_1, P_2 in the same component, the paths $[Q,P_1]$ and $[Q,P_2]$ share an initial segment. Because of this, the components are in $1-1$ correspondence with germs of paths emanating from Q, which we call *tangent vectors* $\vec{v}$ at Q. We write T_Q for the set of tangent vectors at Q. If Q is of type I or type IV, then T_Q has one element; if Q is of type III, T_Q has two elements. If Q is of type II, then T_Q is in $1-1$ correspondence with $\mathbb{P}^1(\widetilde{k})$, for the residue field $\widetilde{k} = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m}$.

Definition 1. For each $\vec{v} \in T_Q$, we write $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v})^-$ for the component of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{Q\}$ containing points for which $[Q,P]$ prolongs $\vec{v}$. If $P \in \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v})^-$, we say that P is in the direction $\vec{v}$ at Q. Given $P \neq Q$, we write $\vec{v}_P$ for the direction in T_Q such that $P \in B_Q(\vec{v}_P)^-$.

Let $\mathrm{ord}(x)$ be the additive valuation on K corresponding to $|x|$; there is a unique base $q > 1$ for which $\mathrm{ord}(x) = -\log_q(|x|)$. We will write $\log(z)$ for $\log_q(z)$. The set $\mathbf{H}^1_K = \mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is called the *Berkovich upper halfspace*; it carries a metric $\rho(x,y)$ called the *logarithmic path distance*, for which the length of the path corresponding to the chain of discs $\{D(a,r) : R_1 \le r \le R_2\}$ is $\log(R_2/R_1)$.

There are two natural topologies on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, called the *weak* and *strong* topologies. The basic open sets for the weak topology are the path-components of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ as $\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ ranges over finite subsets of $\mathbf{H}^1_K$. Under the weak topology, $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ is compact, and $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is dense in it. The weak topology is not in general defined by a metric. The basic open sets for the strong topology are the $\rho(x,y)$-balls

$$\mathcal{B}_\rho(x,r)^- \;=\; \{z \in \mathbf{H}^1_K : \rho(x,z) < r\}$$

for $x \in \mathbf{H}^1_K$ and $r > 0$, together with the basic open sets from the weak topology. Under the strong topology, $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ is complete but not compact. The strong topology is induced by the Favre-Rivera Letelier metric $d(x,y)$, defined at (8) below. Type II points are dense in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ for both topologies.

For each $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$, the action of $\varphi(z)$ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ extends functorially to an action on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ which is continuous for both the weak and strong topologies. If φ is nonconstant, the action is open, surjective, and preserves the type of each point. The action of $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ on type II points corresponds to its 'generic' action on punctured discs, in the following sense. Let $D(a,r)^- = \{z \in K : |z-a| < r\}$. One has $\varphi(\zeta_{a,r}) = \zeta_{b,R}$ if

and only if there are finitely many points $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in D(a,r)$ and finitely many points $b_1, \ldots, b_m \in D(b,R)$ such that

$$\varphi\big(D(a,r)\backslash \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} D(a_i,r)^-\big) \;=\; D(b,R)\backslash \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} D(b_j,R)^-$$

(see [1], Proposition 2.8). For example, the inversion map $\iota(z) = 1/z$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \iota(D(0,r)\backslash D(0,r)^-) \;=\; D(0,1/r)\backslash D(0,1/r)^- \;, \\ \iota(D(a,r)\backslash D(a,r)^-) \;=\; D(1/a, r/|a|^2)\backslash D(1/a, r/|a|^2)^- \quad \text{if } |a| > r \quad . \end{cases}$$

Since a disc can be written as $D(0,r)$ if and only if $|a| \le r$, one has

$$\iota(\zeta_{a,r}) \;=\; \begin{cases} \zeta_{0,1/r} & \text{if } |a| \le r \quad , \\ \zeta_{1/a, r/|a|^2} & \text{if } |a| > r \quad . \end{cases}$$

In particular, the action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ though linear fractional transformations extends to an action on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, which is transitive on type I points and type II points. The action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ preserves the logarithmic path distance: $\rho(\gamma(x),\gamma(y)) = \rho(x,y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^1_K$ and $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$. The stabilizer of ζ_G in $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ is $K^\times \cdot \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$.

If we identify $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ with $K \cup \{\infty\}$ and make the usual conventions for arithmetic operations involving ∞, the spherical metric on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is given by

$$\|x,y\| \;=\; \begin{cases} |x-y| & \text{if } |x|, |y| \le 1 \quad , \\ |1/x - 1/y| & \text{if } |x|, |y| > 1 \quad , \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \quad . \end{cases}$$

For $x, y \neq \infty$, one has $\|x,y\| = \; |x-y|/\big(\max(1,|x|)\max(1,|y|)\big)$. For all $x, y \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and all $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, one has $\|\gamma(x),\gamma(y)\| = \|x,y\|$.

We will use two "diameter" functions on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$. For $x \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$, the diameter of x with respect to the point $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is given by

$$\mathrm{diam}_\infty(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in K \;, \\ r & \text{if } x = \zeta_{a,r} \text{ is of type II or III} \quad , \\ \inf\{r : \zeta_{a,r} \in (x,\infty)\} & \text{if } x \text{ is of type IV} \quad , \\ \infty & \text{if } x = \infty \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \;. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

The function $\mathrm{diam}_\infty(x)$ is preserved by translations: for any $b \in K$, if $\gamma(z) = z + b$, then $\mathrm{diam}_\infty(\gamma(x)) = \mathrm{diam}_\infty(x)$.

The diameter with respect to the Gauss point ζ_G is defined by

$$\mathrm{diam}_G(x) \;=\; q^{-\rho(\zeta_G, x)} \;. \tag{6}$$

If $x = \zeta_{a,r}$ is a point of type II or III, one has

$$\mathrm{diam}_G(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} r & \text{if } |a|, |r| \le 1 \\ r/|a|^2 & \text{if } |a| > 1 \text{ and } r < |a| \\ 1/r & \text{if } r > 1 \text{ and } |a| \le r \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Evidently $0 \le \mathrm{diam}_G(x) \le 1$, with $\mathrm{diam}_G(x) < 1$ if $x \neq \zeta_G$, and $\mathrm{diam}_G(x) = 0$ if and only $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. For each $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, one has $\mathrm{diam}_G(\gamma(x)) = \mathrm{diam}_G(x)$. Moreover,

$\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ acts transitively on type I points, and, for a given $r \in |K^\times|$, on type II points with $\mathrm{diam}_G(x) = r$. If $a, b \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, then

$$\mathrm{diam}_G(a \vee_G b) \;=\; \|a, b\| \;.$$

The Favre-Rivera Letelier metric $d(x, y)$ is defined by

$$d(x, y) \;=\; \big(\mathrm{diam}_G(x \vee_G y) - \mathrm{diam}_G(x)\big) + \big(\mathrm{diam}_G(x \vee_G y) - \mathrm{diam}_G(y)\big) \;. \tag{8}$$

One has $0 \le d(x, y) \le 2$ for all x, y. To see that $d(x, y)$ is a metric, note that it is positive if $x \ne y$, and is clearly symmetric. It satisfies the triangle inequality $d(x, z) \le d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ because it is additive on paths: if Q is any point in $[x, y]$, then $d(x, y) = d(x, Q) + d(Q, y)$.

Proposition 1.1. *The metric $d(x, y)$ has the following properties:*
(1) *$d(\gamma(x), \gamma(y)) = d(x, y)$ for each $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$;*
(2) *$d(a, b) = 2\|a, b\|$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$.*

Proof. Assertion (1) follows from the definition of $d(x, y)$ and the fact that $K^\times \cdot \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ stabilizes ζ_G and preserves the metric $\rho(x, y)$. Assertion (2) follows from the fact that $\mathrm{diam}_G(a \vee_G b) = \|a, b\|$. □

In addition to the balls $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v})^-$ and $\mathcal{B}_\rho(x, r)^-$ introduced above, we will use several other kinds of balls and discs. In naming them, we make the convention that *Roman letters* will be used for sets in $\mathbb{A}^1(K)$ or $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and *script letters* for ones in $\mathbf{A}^1_K$ or $\mathbf{P}^1_K$. Also, we speak of *discs* in $\mathbb{A}^1(K)$ and $\mathbf{A}^1_K$, and *balls* in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and $\mathbf{P}^1_K$.

For each $a \in K$ and $0 < r < \infty$ we have the classical discs

$$D(a, r)^- = \{z \in \mathbb{A}^1(K) : |z - a| < r\}, \quad D(a, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{A}^1(K) : |z - a| \le r\}.$$

The associated Berkovich discs are

$$\mathcal{D}(a, r)^- = \{x \in \mathbf{A}^1_K : \zeta_{a,r} \in (x, \infty]\}, \quad \mathcal{D}(a, r) \;= \{x \in \mathbf{A}^1_K : \zeta_{a,r} \in [x, \infty]\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}(a, r)^-$ is the path-component of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{\zeta_{a,r}\}$ containing $D(a, r)^-$, and $\mathcal{D}(a, r)$ is the union of $\{\zeta_{a,r}\}$ and the path components of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{\zeta_{a,r}\}$ which do not contain ∞. If $\vec{v}_a \in T_{\zeta_{a,r}}$ points towards a, and $\vec{v}_\infty \in T_{\zeta_{a,r}}$ points towards ∞, then

$$\mathcal{D}(a, r)^- \;=\; \mathcal{B}_{\zeta_{a,r}}(\vec{v}_a)^- \;, \quad \mathcal{D}(a, r) = \mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathcal{B}_{Q_{a,r}}(\vec{v}_\infty)^- \;.$$

For either the weak or strong topology, $\mathcal{D}(a, r)^-$ is open, and $\mathcal{D}(a, r)$ is closed.

Given $a \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$ and $0 < r < 1$, we write

$$B(a, r)^- = \{z \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) : \|z, a\| < r\} \;, \quad B(a, r) = \{z \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) : \|z, a\| \le r\}.$$

There is a unique point $Q_{a,r} \in [a, \zeta_G]$ for which $\mathrm{diam}_G(Q_{a,r}) = r$. The associated Berkovich balls are

$$\mathcal{B}(a, r)^- = \{x \in \mathbf{P}^1_K : Q_{a,r} \in (x, \zeta_G]\}, \quad \mathcal{B}(a, r) = \{z \in \mathbf{P}^1_K : Q_{a,r} \in [x, \zeta_G]\}.$$

When $r = 1$, we define $B(a, 1)^- = \bigcup_{r<1} B(a, r)^-$ and $\mathcal{B}(a, 1)^- = \bigcup_{r<1} \mathcal{B}(a, r)^-$. Note that $\mathcal{B}(a, r)^-$ is the path-component of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{Q_{a,r}\}$ containing $B(a, r)^-$, and $\mathcal{B}(a, r)$ is the union of $\{Q_{a,r}\}$ and the path components of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{Q_{a,r}\}$ which do not contain ζ_G. For either the weak or strong topology, $\mathcal{B}(a, r)^-$ is open, and $\mathcal{B}(a, r)$ is closed. If $\vec{v}_a \in T_{Q_{a,r}}$ is the tangent vector pointing towards a, one has

$$\mathcal{B}(a, r)^- \;=\; \mathcal{B}_{Q_{a,r}}(\vec{v}_a)^- \;, \quad \mathcal{B}(a, r) = \mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathcal{B}_{Q_{a,r}}(\vec{v}_{\zeta_G})^- \;.$$

For any $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, one has $\gamma(\mathcal{B}(a,r)^-) = \mathcal{B}(\gamma(a),r)^-$ and $\gamma(\mathcal{B}(a,r)) = \mathcal{B}(\gamma(a),r)$.

Given a nonconstant function $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$, we define its Berkovich Lipschitz constant (relative to the Favre-Rivera-Letelier metric $d(x,y)$), to be

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;=\; \sup_{\substack{x,y\in\mathbf{P}^1_K \\ x\neq y}} \frac{d(\varphi(x),\varphi(y))}{d(x,y)}\ . \tag{9}$$

Proposition 1.2. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. Then for any $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, one has $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\gamma_1 \circ \varphi \circ \gamma_2) = \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$.*

Proof. This follows from the definition of $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ and the fact that $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ preserves $d(x,y)$. □

2. Preliminary Lemmas

In this section we prove some lemmas which reduce bounding $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ to bounding it on a restricted class of segments $[x,y]$.

Definition 2. Fix $0 < B_0 \leq 1$. A segment $[b,c] \subset \mathbf{P}^1_K$ will be called *radial* if it is contained in a segment $[\xi,\zeta_G]$, and it will be called *B_0-limited* if it is either contained in a segment $[\alpha,\xi]$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and $\mathrm{diam}_G(\xi) = B_0$, or in a segment $[\xi,\zeta_G]$, where $\mathrm{diam}_G(\xi) = B_0$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$, put $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$, and let $[b,c] \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$ be a segment. Then there is a finite partition $\{a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1}\}$ of $[b,c]$ such that $a_1 = b$, $a_{n+1} = c$, and each of $a_2,\ldots,a_n$ is of type* II*, such that for each $i = 1,\ldots,n$,*

1. *φ maps the segment $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ homeomorphically onto $[\varphi(a_i),\varphi(a_{i+1})]$;*
2. *$[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ and $[\varphi(a_i),\varphi(a_{i+1})]$ are both radial, and $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ is B_0-limited;*
3. *there is an integer $1 \leq \delta_i \leq d$ such that $\deg_\varphi(x) = \delta_i$ for each $x \in (a_i,a_{i+1})$;*
4. *$\rho(\varphi(x),\varphi(y)) = \delta_i \cdot \rho(x,y)$ for all $x,y \in [a_i,a_{i+1}]$; and*
5. *there are a constant $C_i > 0$ and an integer $k_i = \pm\delta_i$ such that for each $x \in [a_i,a_{i+1}]$, if we put $r = \mathrm{diam}_G(x)$ and $R = \mathrm{diam}_G(\varphi(x))$, then $R = C_i \cdot r^{k_i}$.*

Proof. The existence of a partition $\{a_1,\ldots,a_{n+1}\}$ satisfying conditions (1), (3) and (4) is due to Rivera-Letelier (see [9], Corollaries 4.7 and 4.8, or [1], Theorem 9.33). To refine the partition so that it satisfies (2), successively carry out the following adjunctions:

(A) To assure that each segment $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ is radial, adjoin ζ_G to the partition if $\zeta_G \in [b,c]$, and for each $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ which is now not radial, let $t_i = a_i \wedge_G a_{i+1}$ be the nearest point in $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ to ζ_G, and adjoint it to the partition.

(B) To assure that each each segment $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ is B_0-limited, for each $[a_i,a_{i+1}]$ which is not B_0-limited, let $\xi_i \in [a_i,a_{i+1}]$ be the unique point with $\mathrm{diam}_G(\xi_i) = B_0$, and adjoin it to the partition;

(C) To assure that each segment $[\varphi(a_i),\varphi(a_{i+1})]$ is radial, consider each of the finitely many pre-images of ζ_G under φ, and if it belongs to $[b,c]$, then adjoint it to the partition.

Assertion (5) is now immediate. There is a base $q > 1$ such that for each $x \in \mathbb{H}^1_K$ one has $\rho(\zeta_G,x) = -\log_q(\mathrm{diam}_G(x))$. Hence $\rho(\zeta_G,x) = -\log_q(r)$ and $\rho(\zeta_G,\varphi(x)) = -\log_q(R)$.

By (2) and (4), for an appropriate choice of $k_i = \pm\delta_i$, for each $x \in [a_i, a_{i+1}]$,

$$\rho(\zeta_G, \varphi(x)) - \rho(\zeta_G, \varphi(a_i)) \;=\; k_i \cdot \big(\rho(\zeta_G, x) - \rho(\zeta_G, a_i)\big)$$

and (5) follows by exponentiating this. □

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$, and put $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$. Let $\mathcal{I}(B_0)$ be the collection of all radial segments of the form $[\alpha, \xi]$ or $[\xi, \zeta_G]$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and $\mathrm{diam}_G(\xi) = B_0$. If $L \in \mathbb{R}$ is an upper bound for $\{\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_I) : I \in \mathcal{I}(B_0)\}$, then L is an upper bound for $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$.*

Proof. We must show that $d(\varphi(b), \varphi(c)) \leq L \cdot d(b, c)$ for all $b, c \in \mathbf{P}^1_K$. This is trivial if $b = c$, so we can assume $b \neq c$.

First suppose b and c are of type II, and take a partition $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}\}$ of $[b, c]$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 2.1. Each subsegment $[a_i, a_{i+1}]$ is contained in some $I \in \mathcal{I}(B_0)$, so $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[a_i,a_{i+1}]}) \leq \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_I) \leq L$. Furthermore $d(b, c) = \sum_{i=1}^n d(a_i, a_{i+1})$, so

$$\begin{aligned} d(\varphi(b), \varphi(c)) \;&\leq\; \sum_{i=1}^n d\big(\varphi(a_i), \varphi(a_{i+1})\big) \;\leq\; \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[a_i,a_{i+1}]}) \cdot d(a_i, a_{i+1}) \\ &\leq\; L \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n d(a_i, a_{i+1}) \;=\; L \cdot d(b, c)\ . \end{aligned}$$

Now let $b \neq c$ in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ be arbitrary. Choose an exhaustion of (b, c) by segments

$$[b^{(1)}, c^{(1)}] \;\subset\; [b^{(2)}, c^{(2)}] \;\subset\; \cdots \subset\; [b^{(j)}, c^{(j)}] \;\subset\; \cdots \subset\; (b, c)\ .$$

with type II endpoints. Then

$$d\big(\varphi(b), \varphi(c)\big) \;=\; \lim_{j\to\infty} d\big(\varphi(b^{(j)}), \varphi(c^{(j)})\big) \;\leq\; \lim_{j\to\infty} L \cdot d\big(b^{(j)}, c^{(j)}\big) \;=\; L \cdot d(b, c)\ .$$

Letting b and c range over $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, we see that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \leq L$. □

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$, and put $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$. Let $I = [b, c]$ be a segment in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ with $b \neq c$, and let $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}\}$ be a partition of $[b, c]$ with the properties in Lemma 2.1. For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, put $r_i = \min(\mathrm{diam}_G(a_i), \mathrm{diam}_G(a_{i+1}))$, $s_i = \max(\mathrm{diam}_G(a_i), \mathrm{diam}_G(a_{i+1}))$, and define $F_{\varphi,i} : [r_i, s_i] \to \mathbb{R}$ by $F_{\varphi,i}(r) = C_i \cdot r^{k_i}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_I) \;=\; \max_{1\leq i\leq n} \Big(\sup_{r\in(r_i,s_i)} \big|F'_{\varphi,i}(r)\big| \Big)\ .$$

Proof. It suffices to show that for each i, $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[a_i,a_{i+1}]}) = \sup_{r\in(r_i,s_i)} |F'_{\varphi,i}(r)|$.

Take $x \neq y$ in $[a_i, a_{i+1}]$, and put $u = \mathrm{diam}_G(x)$, $v = \mathrm{diam}_G(y)$. Without loss we can assume that $r < s$. By the Mean Value Theorem there is an $r_* \in (u, v)$ such that

$$F_{\varphi,i}(v) - F_{\varphi,i}(u) \;=\; F'_{\varphi,i}(r_*) \cdot (v - u)\ , \tag{10}$$

so $d(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) = |F'_{\varphi,i}(r_*)| \cdot d(x, y)$. Hence $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[a_i,a_{i+1}]}) \leq \sup_{r\in(r_i,s_i)} |F'_{\varphi,i}(r)|$.

The opposite inequality follows from the fact that $F'_{\varphi,i}(r)$ is continuous: for each $r_\# \in (r_i, s_i)$ and each $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $[r_\# - \delta, r_\# + \delta] \subset (r_i, s_i)$, and $|F'_{\varphi,i}(t) - F'_{\varphi,i}(r_\#)| < \varepsilon$ for all $t \in [r_\# - \delta, r_\# + \delta]$. Take $x, y \in [a_i, a_{i+1}]$ with $r_\# - \delta < \mathrm{diam}_G(x) < \mathrm{diam}_G(y) < r_\# + \delta$, and let r_* be as in (10) for this choice of x, y. Then $|F'_{\varphi,i}(r_*) - F'_{\varphi,i}(r_\#)| < \varepsilon$. It follows that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[a_i,a_{i+1}]}) \geq \sup_{r\in(r_i,s_i)} |F'_{\varphi,i}(r)|$. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\Phi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$; write $B_0 = B_0(\Phi)$, put $c_0 = \Phi(0)$, and assume $\Phi(D(0, B_0)^-) = D(c_0, R)^-$. Expand*

$$\Phi(z) \;=\; c_0 + (c_1 z + c_2 z^2 + \cdots c_n z^n) \cdot U(z) \;,$$

on $D(0, B_0)^-$, where $U(z)$ is a unit power series. Then we can partition $[0, B_0]$ into finitely many subintervals $[r_i, r_{i+1}]$, where $0 = r_1 < \cdots < r_{\ell+1} = B_0$, such that on $[r_i, r_{i+1}]$ we have

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; f_i(r) \;:=\; |c_{k(i)}| \cdot r^{k(i)}$$

for a suitable index $k(i)$. Let $f'_\Phi(r) = \lim_{h \to 0^+}(f_\Phi(r+h) - f_\Phi(r))/h$ be the right-derivative of f on $[0, B_0)$. Then $f'_\Phi(r)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, B_0)$, and for each $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$ we have $k(i) \leq k(i+1)$.

Remark. There is a minimal partition with the properties in Lemma 2.4, which has the additional property that $k(i) < k(i+1)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$. However, in the applications the partition we use may not be minimal, so we only assume that $k(i) \leq k(i+1)$.

Proof. We will regard each $f_i(r) = |c_{k(i)}| \cdot r^{k(i)}$ as defined for all $r \geq 0$. Clearly $f_i(r)$ is continuous and monotone increasing, and $f'_i(r) = k(i)|c_{k(i)}|r^{k(i)-1}$ is continuous and nondecreasing.

Since $f_\Phi(r)$ is continuous and monotone increasing, at each break point r_i we must have $f'_{i-1}(r_i) \leq f'_i(r_i)$. Thus $f'_\Phi(r)$ is non-decreasing. Furthermore at each such r_i

$$k(i-1) \cdot \frac{f_{i-1}(r_i)}{r_i} \;=\; f'_{i-1}(r_i) \;\leq\; f'_i(r_i) \;=\; k(i) \cdot \frac{f_i(r_i)}{r_i} \;,$$

so since $f_{i-1}(r_i) = f_i(r_i)$ we must have $k(i-1) \leq k(i)$. □

3. Lipschitz constants for Linear Fractional Transformations

When $\varphi \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$, one can find its Lipschitz constants exactly:

Theorem 3.1. *Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean field, and let $\varphi(z) = (az + b)/(cz + d) \in K(z)$ have degree $d = 1$. Then $B_0(\varphi) = 1$, and*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;&=\; \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)} \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)} \\ &=\; \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|} \;=\; \frac{\max(\,|a|, |b|, |c|, |d|\,)}{|ad - bc|} \;. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Theorem 3.1 is a restatement of Theorem 0.4 in the Introduction. Write $[\varphi]$ for the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \;.$$

Since φ is unchanged when $[\varphi]$ is scaled by an element of $K^\times$, we can assume that $[\varphi] \in M_2(\mathcal{O})$ and $\max(|a|, |b|, |c|, |d|) = 1$. Since $d(x, y)$ and $\|x, y\|$ are preservied by $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, we can pre- and post-compose φ with elements of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ without changing $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi)$; such compositions also preserve $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$, $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$, the value of $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)| = |ad - bc|$, and the fact that $\max(|a|, |b|, |c|, |d|) = 1$. Choosing $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in$

$\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ to carry out appropriate combinations of elementary row and column operations, and setting $\Phi = \gamma_1 \circ \varphi \circ \gamma_2$, we can arrange that

$$[\Phi] \;=\; \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$$

where $D \in \mathcal{O}\backslash\{0\}$. Note that $\Phi(\zeta_G) = \zeta_{0,1/|D|}$, so $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) = \mathrm{GIR}(\Phi) = |D| = |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. Similarly $\Phi(\zeta_{0,|D|}) = \zeta_G$, so $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) = \mathrm{GPR}(\Phi) = |D|$. Trivially $B_0(\varphi) = B_0(\Phi) = 1$.

We will now show that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi) = 1/|D|$. Recall that

$$\mathrm{diam}_G(\zeta_{a,r}) \;=\; \begin{cases} r & \text{if } |a|, r \le 1 \quad , \\ r/|a|^2 & \text{if } |a| > 1 \text{ and } r < |a| \quad , \\ 1/r & \text{if } |a| \le 1 \text{ and } r \ge 1, \text{ or if } 1 < |a| \le r \quad . \end{cases}$$

For future use, note that the three formulas on the right can be combined the a single expression

$$\mathrm{diam}_G(\zeta_{a,r}) \;=\; \frac{r}{\max(1, |a|, r)^2} \; . \tag{11}$$

Given a point $\zeta_{a,r} \in \mathbb{A}^1_{\mathrm{Berk}}$, we have $\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}) = \zeta_{a/D, r/|D|}$. It follows that

$$\mathrm{diam}_G(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r})) \;=\; \begin{cases} r/|D| & \text{if } |a|, r \le |D| \quad , \\ r|D|/|a|^2 & \text{if } |a| > |D| \text{ and } r < |a| \quad , \\ |D|/r & \text{if } |a| \le |D| \text{ and } r \ge |D|, \text{ or if } |D| < |a| \le r \quad . \end{cases}$$

Since points of type II and III are dense in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$ for the strong topology, it suffices to bound $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi)$ on paths $[a, \infty]$ where $a \in K$. The remainder of the argument is a case by case verification.

Fix $a \in K$, and consider a point $\zeta_{a,r}$. If $|a| \le |D|$ and $s < r \le |D|$ then

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{a,s}))}{d(\zeta_{a,r}, \zeta_{a,s})} \;=\; \frac{r/|D| - s/|D|}{r - s} \;=\; \frac{1}{|D|} \; .$$

If $|a| \le |D|$ and $|D| \le s < r$, then $|a/D| \le 1$ while $1 \le s/|D| < r/|D|$, so

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{a,s}))}{d(\zeta_{a,r}, \zeta_{a,s})} \;=\; \frac{|D|/s - |D|/r}{r - s} \;=\; \frac{|D|}{rs} \;<\; \frac{1}{|D|} \; .$$

If $|D| < |a| \le 1$ and $0 < s < r \le |a|$, then

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{a,s}))}{d(\zeta_{a,r}, \zeta_{a,s})} \;=\; \frac{(r/|D|)/(|a/D|)^2 - (s/|D|)/(|a/D|)^2)}{r - s} \;=\; \frac{|D|}{|a|^2} \;<\; \frac{1}{|D|} \; .$$

If $|D| < |a| \le 1$ and $|a| \le s < r$, then $1 < |a/D| \le s/|D| < r/|D|$ so again

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{a,s}))}{d(\zeta_{a,r}, \zeta_{a,s})} \;=\; \frac{|D|/s - |D|/r}{r - s} \;=\; \frac{|D|}{rs} \;<\; \frac{1}{|D|} \; .$$

If $|a| > 1$ and $0 < s < r \le |a|$, then

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{a,s}))}{d(\zeta_{a,r}, \zeta_{a,s})} \;=\; \frac{(r/|D|)/(|a|/|D|)^2 - (s/|D|)/(|a|/|D|)^2)}{r/|a|^2 - s/|a|^2} \;=\; |D| \;\le\; \frac{1}{|D|} \; .$$

Finally, if $|a| > 1$ and $|a| \le s < r$, then $\zeta_{a,s} = \zeta_{0,s}$ and $\zeta_{a,r} = \zeta_{0,r}$ so

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{a,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{a,s}))}{d(\zeta_{a,r}, \zeta_{a,s})} \;=\; \frac{|D|/s - |D|/r}{1/s - 1/r} \;=\; |D| \;\le\; \frac{1}{|D|} \; .$$

Thus $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) = \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi) = 1/|D|$.

Clearly $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\Phi) \le \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi) = 1/|D|$. To prove that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\Phi) = 1/|D|$, it suffices to show that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\Phi) \ge 1/|D|$. This is trivial, since if $x = 0$ and $y = D$, then $\|x, y\| = \|0, D\| = |D|$ and $\|\Phi(x), \Phi(y)\| = \|0, 1\| = 1$. □

4. Some Auxiliary Constants

In this section, we study the four constants associated to φ in the Introduction: the Gauss Pre-Image radius, the Root-Pole number, the Ball-Mapping radius, and the Gauss Image radius.

Definition 3. Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \ge 1$.

(A) The Gauss Image radius of φ is $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) = \mathrm{diam}_G(\varphi(\zeta_G))$.

(B) The Root-Pole number of φ is

$$\mathrm{RP}(\varphi) \;=\; \min\{\|\alpha, \beta\| : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{P}^1(K), \varphi(\alpha) = 0, \varphi(\beta) = \infty\} \; .$$

(C) The Ball-Mapping radius of φ is

$$B_0(\varphi) = \sup\{0 < r \le 1 : \text{for all } a \in \mathbb{P}^1(K),\ \varphi(\mathcal{B}(a, r)^-) \ne \mathbf{P}^1_K\} \; .$$

(D) The Gauss Pre-Image radius of φ is

$$\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \;=\; \min\{\mathrm{diam}_G(x) : x \in \mathbf{P}^1_K, \varphi(x) = \zeta_G\} \; .$$

Clearly the Ball-Mapping radius, the Gauss Image radius, and the Gauss Pre-Image radius are invariant under pre- and post- composition of φ with elements of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$; the Ball-Mapping radius is also invariant under post-composition of φ with elements of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$. The Root-Pole number is not invariant under either pre- or post- composition by $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, but it lies between the Gauss Pre-Image radius and the Ball-Mapping radius:

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \ge 1$. Then*

$$0 \;<\; \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \;\le\; \mathrm{RP}(\varphi) \;\le\; B_0(\varphi) \;\le\; 1 \; .$$

Proof. Since there are most d pre-images of ζ_G under φ, which all lie in $\mathbb{H}^1_K$, clearly $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) > 0$. Also, by the definition of $B_0(\varphi)$, we trivially have $B_0(\varphi) \le 1$.

It is also easy to see that $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \le \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$. Indeed, if $r = \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$, then there are a root α and a pole β of φ with $\|\alpha, \beta\| = r$. The image of the path $[\alpha, \beta]$ under φ is connected and contains 0 and ∞, so it contains the path $[0, \infty]$. Hence it contains ζ_G, and there is a point x of $\varphi^{-1}(\zeta_G)$ in $[\alpha, \beta]$. It follows that $r = \mathrm{diam}_G(\alpha \wedge_G \beta) \ge \mathrm{diam}_G(x) \ge \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$.

Finally, we show that $\mathrm{RP}(\varphi) \le B_0(\varphi)$. If $B_0(\varphi) = 1$, then trivially $\mathrm{RP}(\varphi) \le B_0(\varphi)$, since $\|\alpha, \beta\| \le 1$ for any pair of elements $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Suppose $B_0(\varphi) < 1$, and take any r with $B_0(\varphi) < r \le 1$. Since $r > B_0(\varphi)$, there is a ball $\mathcal{B}(a, r)^-$ with $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(a, r)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$. Hence there are $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \cap \mathcal{B}(a, r)^-$ such that $\varphi(\alpha) = 0$, $\varphi(\beta) = \infty$. It follows that $r > \|\alpha, \beta\| \ge \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$. Since $B_0(\varphi)$ is the infimum of all such r, we must have $B_0(\varphi) \ge \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$. □

The inequalities $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \le \mathrm{RP}(\varphi) \le B_0(\varphi)$ in Proposition 4.1 can both be strict. For example, consider the polynomial $\varphi(z) = z^2 - 1/p^2 \in \mathbb{C}_p[z]$, where p is an odd prime. One sees easily that $\varphi^{-1}(\zeta_G) = \{\zeta_{1/p,1/p}, \zeta_{-1/p,1/p}\}$ so $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) = p^{-3}$. The zeros of φ are $\{\pm 1/p\}$ and the only pole is $\{\infty\}$, so $\mathrm{RP}(\varphi) = p^{-1}$. Finally, the only solution to

$\varphi(z) = -1/p^2$ is $z = 0$. It follows that if $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(a,r)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$ for some ball, then both $0, \infty \in \mathcal{B}(a,r)^-$. This is impossible with $r < 1$, so $B_0(\varphi) = 1$.

Our next proposition says that $B_0(\varphi) \in |K^\times|$, and there is a ball which realizes it.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$, and put $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$. Then $B_0 \in |K^\times|$. Moreover, if $B_0 < 1$ (so necessarily $d \geq 2$), there is an $\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ for which $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(a, B_0)^-)$ is a ball, but $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(\alpha, B_0)) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$.*

Proof. The proof uses the theory of the "crucial set" from ([11], [12]).

Write $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$. If $d = 1$, then $B_0 = 1$, and the assertions are trivial. Assume $d \geq 2$. If $B_0 = 1$, the assertions are again trivial, so we can assume $0 < B_0 < 1$. Choose a sequence of numbers $1 > R_1 > R_2 > \cdots > B_0$ in $|K^\times|$ with $\lim_{i\to\infty} R_i = B_0$, and a sequence of balls $\mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-$ such that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$ for each i. Each of the balls $\mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-$ can be written in the form $\mathcal{B}_{P_i}(\vec{v}_i)^-$ where P_i is a type II point and $\vec{v}_i \in T_{P_i}$ is a suitable tangent vector.

By the proof of Theorem 4.6 of [12] (alternately see Theorem 4.6 of [11]), each $\mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-$ contains either a classical fixed point of φ (that is, a fixed point in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$), or a repelling fixed point of φ in $\mathbf{H}^1_K$ of a special type, a *focused repelling fixed point*. A focused repelling fixed point is a type II point Q with $\varphi(Q) = Q$, such that $\deg_\varphi(Q) \geq 2$ and there is a unique $\vec{v}_\# \in T_Q$ for which $\varphi_*(\vec{v}_\#) = \vec{v}_\#$. (We are using the case of ([11], [12], Theorem 4.6) concerning a ball with a type II boundary point: each such ball is dealt with by one of Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, and 4.5 of ([11], [12]). Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 produce classical fixed points in $\mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-$, while Lemma 4.5 produces either a classical fixed point or a focused repelling fixed point.) By ([11], [12], Proposition 3.1) $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v}_\#)^-$ contains all the classical fixed points of φ, and $\varphi(\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v}_\#)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$. There are at most $d+1$ classical fixed points of φ, and by ([11], [12], Corollary 6.3) there are at most $d-1$ repelling fixed points of φ in $\mathbf{H}^1_K$. Thus we can apply the Pigeon-hole Principle to the balls and fixed points.

First suppose there is a classical fixed point α which is contained in infinitely many balls $\mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-$. By replacing the sequence of balls with a subsequence, we can assume $\alpha \in \mathcal{B}(a_i, R_i)^-$ for each i. After conjugating φ by a suitable element of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, we can assume that $\alpha = 0$, and that the sequence of balls is $\{\mathcal{B}(0, R_i)^-\}_{i\geq 1}$. Suppose $B_0 \notin |K^\times|$. Then the point $P = \zeta_{0,B_0}$ is of type III. The tangent space T_P consists of two directions $\vec{v}_0, \vec{v}_\infty$, and $\mathcal{B}(0, B_0)^- = \mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v}_0)^-$. Put $Q = \varphi(P)$, $\vec{w}_1 = \varphi_*(\vec{v}_0)$ and $\vec{w}_2 = \varphi_*(\vec{v}_\infty)$. Necessarily Q is of type III, and $\vec{w}_1, \vec{w}_2$ are the two tangent directions in T_Q (see [1], Corollary 9.20). By the definition of the ball mapping radius, $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v}_0)^-)$ is a ball, hence necessarily $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v}_0))^-) = \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_1)^-$. By Rivera-Letelier's Annulus Mapping Theorem (see [1], Lemma 9.45), there is a point $P_1 \in \mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v}_\infty)^-$ for which $\varphi(\mathrm{Ann}(P, P_1))$ is an annulus $\mathrm{Ann}(Q, Q_1) \subset \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_2)^-$. Without loss we can suppose $P_1 = \zeta_{0,R}$ for some $R > B_0$. Since $\mathcal{B}(0,R)^- = \mathcal{B}(0,B_0)^- \cup \{P\} \cup \mathrm{Ann}(P, P_1)$, it follows that

$$\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,R)^-) \;=\; \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_1)^- \cup \{Q\} \cup \mathrm{Ann}(Q, Q_1) \;\neq\; \mathbf{P}^1_K \;.$$

This contradicts that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,R_i)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$ when $B_0 < R_i < R$, hence $B_0 \in |K^\times|$.

By definition $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)^-)$ is a ball; we claim that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$. Suppose this were not the case; write $P = \zeta_{0,B_0}$ and put $Q = \varphi(P)$. Let $\vec{v}_\infty \in T_P$ be the direction containing ∞, and put $\vec{w}_\infty = \varphi_*(\vec{v}_\infty) \in T_Q$. The map $\varphi_* : T_P \to T_Q$ is surjective, so

for each $\vec{w} \in T_Q$ with $\vec{w} \neq \vec{w}_\infty$ there is some $\vec{v} \in T_P$ with $\varphi_*(\vec{v}) = \vec{w}$. Since $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v})^-)$ contains $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w})^-$, we see that

$$\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)) \ \supseteq \ \{Q\} \cup \bigcup_{\vec{w}\neq\vec{w}_\infty} \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w})^- \ \supseteq \ \mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_\infty)^- \ .$$

Moreover, for each $\vec{v} \in T_P$, the image $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v})^-)$ is either a ball or all of $\mathbf{P}^1_K$. (If there were some $\vec{v} \in T_P$ with $\vec{v} \neq \vec{v}_\infty$ for which $\varphi_*(\vec{v}) = \vec{w}_\infty$, then $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0))$ would contain $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_\infty)^-$, hence would be $\mathbf{P}^1_K$.) Thus $\vec{v}_\infty$ is the only direction in T_P with $\varphi_*(\vec{v}) = \vec{v}_\infty$. It follows for each $\vec{v} \neq \vec{v}_\infty$, the image $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v})^-)$ is a ball $\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w})^-$ with $\vec{w} \neq \vec{v}_\infty$, and that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)) = \mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_\infty)^-$. However, now Rivera-Letelier's Annulus mapping theorem shows there is a point $P_1 = \zeta_{0,S_1} \in \mathcal{B}_P(\vec{v}_\infty)^-$ for which $\varphi_*(\mathrm{Ann}(P,P_1))$ is the annulus $\mathrm{Ann}(Q,\varphi(P_1)) \subset \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{w}_\infty)^-$. This would mean that for each R with $B_0 < R < S_1$ $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,R)^-) \neq \mathbf{P}^1_K$, which contradicts the fact that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,R_i)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$ for all i. Hence it must be that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$.

Next consider the case where no classical fixed point is contained in infinitely many $\mathcal{B}(a_i,R_i)^-$. In this situation there must be a focused repelling fixed point ξ which belongs to infinitely many $\mathcal{B}(a_i,R_i)^-$. After passing to a subsequence of the balls, if necessary, we can assume that $\xi \in \mathcal{B}(a_i,R_i)^-$ for each i, and that no classical fixed point is contained in any $\mathcal{B}(a_i,R_i)^-$. After conjugating φ by a suitable element of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ if necessary, we can assume that $\xi = \zeta_{0,S_1}$ for some $S_1 \leq B_0$, and that the sequence of balls is $\{\mathcal{B}(0,R_i)^-\}_{i\geq 1}$. Since ξ is of type II, necessarily $S_1 \in |K^\times|$. Since no $\mathcal{B}(0,R_i)^-$ contains classical fixed points of φ, the distinguished direction $\vec{v}_\# \in T_\xi$ must be $\vec{v}_\# = \vec{v}_\infty$. It follows that $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \mathcal{B}_\xi(\vec{v}_\#)^- = \mathcal{B}(0,S_1)$, and $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,S_1)) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$. If $B_0 > S_1$, then $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,R)^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$ for each R with $B_0 > R > S_1$. This contradicts the definition of the ball mapping radius, so $B_0 = S_1 \in |K^\times|$. The equality $B_0 = S_1$ also shows that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)^-)$ is a ball, but $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$. □

There is a simple formula for $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$ in terms of the coefficients of a normalized representation of φ:

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$, and let (F,G) be a normalized representation of φ. Write $F(X,Y) = a_dX^d + \ldots + a_1XY^{d-1} + a_0Y^d$, $G(X,Y) = b_dX^d + \ldots + b_1XY^{d-1} + b_0Y^d$. Then*

$$\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \ = \ \max_{i\neq j} \left(\left| \det \begin{bmatrix} a_i & a_j \\ b_i & b_j \end{bmatrix} \right| \right) . \tag{12}$$

Proof. Suppose $\varphi(\zeta_G) = Q$. After replacing φ with $\gamma \circ \varphi$ for a suitable $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ we can assume that $Q = \zeta_{0,R}$, where $R = \mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$. Since γ preserves $\mathrm{diam}_G(\cdot)$ and

$$\left| \det \left(\gamma \circ \begin{bmatrix} a_i & a_j \\ b_i & b_j \end{bmatrix} \right) \right| \ = \ \left| \det \begin{bmatrix} a_i & a_j \\ b_i & b_j \end{bmatrix} \right| ,$$

this does not affect (12). Since (F,G) is normalized, for generic $z \in \mathcal{O}_K$ we must have $|F(z,1)| = R$ and $|G(z,1)| = 1$. This means that all coefficients of F must satisfy $|a_i| \leq R$ and at least one coefficient of G must satisfy $|b_j| = 1$.

Next take $C \in K$ with $|C| = R$, and put $\Phi(z) = (1/C)\varphi(z)$. Then $\Phi(\zeta_G) = \zeta_G$, so $\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi) = 1$, and $(F_0(X,Y),G_0(X,Y)) := ((1/C)F(X,Y),G(X,Y))$ is a normalized

representation of Φ. Writing $F_0(X,Y) = A_dX^d + \ldots + A_1XY^{d-1} + A_0Y^d$, $G_0(X,Y) = B_dX^d + \ldots + B_1XY^{d-1} + B_0Y^d$, it suffices to show that

$$\max_{i\neq j}\Big(\Big|\det\begin{bmatrix} A_i & A_j \\ B_i & B_j \end{bmatrix}\Big|\Big) \;=\; 1\ .$$

If this were not the case, then $\widetilde{A}_i\widetilde{B}_j - \widetilde{A}_j\widetilde{B}_i = \widetilde{0} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$ for all $i \neq j$, so one of the vectors $\widetilde{A} = (\widetilde{A}_d, \ldots, \widetilde{A}_0)$, $\widetilde{B} = (\widetilde{B}_d, \ldots, \widetilde{B}_0)$ gotten by reducing the coefficients of F_0, G_0 (mod $\mathfrak{m}$) would be a multiple of the other. Hence Φ would have constant reduction at ζ_G. However, this contradicts ([1], Lemma 2.17), which says that $\Phi(\zeta_G) = \zeta_G$ if and only if Φ has nonconstant reduction. □

We next seek lower bounds for $B_0(\varphi)$, $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$, and $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$ in terms of $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. For this, we will need the following proposition, which is a projective version of the classical formula for the resultant of two polynomials.

Let the zeros $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ of φ in $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ (listed with multiplicity) have homogeneous coordinates

$$(1:\sigma_1), \ldots, (1:\sigma_m), (\delta_{m+1}:1), \ldots, (\delta_d:1)\ ,$$

where $|\sigma_1|, \ldots, |\sigma_m| \leq 1$ and $|\delta_{m+1}|, \ldots, |\delta_d| < 1$. Likewise, let the poles $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d$ of φ (listed with multiplicity) have homogeneous coordinates

$$(1:\tau_1), \ldots, (1:\tau_n), (\eta_{n+1}:1), \ldots, (\eta_d:1)\ ,$$

where $|\tau_1|, \ldots, |\tau_n| \leq 1$ and $|\eta_{n+1}|, \ldots, |\eta_d| < 1$.

Let (F,G) be a normalized representation of φ. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} F(X,Y) &= C_0 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m}(X - \sigma_iY) \cdot \prod_{i=m+1}^{d}(\delta_iX - Y)\ , \\ G(X,Y) &= C_1 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{n}(X - \tau_iY) \cdot \prod_{j=n+1}^{d}(\eta_iX - Y)\ , \end{aligned}$$

where $C_0, C_1 \in K^\times$ satisfy $0 < |C_0|, |C_1| \leq 1$ and $\max(|C_0|, |C_1|) = 1$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\varphi \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. With notations as above, we have*

$$|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)| \;=\; |C_0|^d|C_1|^d \cdot \prod_{i,j=1}^{d} \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\|\ .$$

Proof. By perturbing φ slightly we can assume that none of its zeros or poles are the point $\infty = (0:1)$, while preserving the distances $\|\alpha_i, \beta_j\|$ and the absolute values $|C_0|$, $|C_1|$. (For instance, we can replace φ with $\varphi \circ \gamma$ for a suitable $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, sufficiently close to the identity). If we expand

$$\begin{aligned} F(X,Y) &= a_dX^d + a_{d-1}X^{d-1}Y + \cdots + a_0Y^d\ , \\ G(X,Y) &= b_dX^d + b_{d-1}X^{d-1}Y + \cdots + b_0Y^d\ , \end{aligned}$$

then $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)| = |\mathrm{Res}(F,G)|$ where

$$\mathrm{Res}(F,G) \;=\; \det\left(\begin{bmatrix} a_d & a_{d-1} & \cdots & a_1 & a_0 & & \\ & a_d & a_{d-1} & \cdots & a_1 & a_0 & \\ & & & & \vdots & & \\ & & & a_d & a_{d-1} & \cdots & a_1 & a_0 \\ b_d & b_{d-1} & \cdots & b_1 & b_0 & & \\ & b_d & b_{d-1} & \cdots & b_1 & b_0 & \\ & & & & \vdots & & \\ & & & b_d & b_{d-1} & \cdots & b_1 & b_0 \end{bmatrix}\right), \tag{13}$$

Here, $a_d = C_0 \cdot \prod_{i=m+1}^{d} \delta_i$ and $b_d = C_1 \cdot \prod_{j=n+1}^{d} \eta_j$.

Now dehomogenize $F(X,Y)$ and $G(X,Y)$, setting $z = X/Y$, obtaining

$$f(z) \;=\; a_d z^d + a_{d-1} z^{d-1} + \cdots + a_0 \;=\; a_d \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{d} (z - \alpha_i)\ ,$$

$$g(z) \;=\; b_d z^d + b_{d-1} z^{d-1} + \cdots + b_0 \;=\; b_d \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{d} (z - \beta_j)\ .$$

where $z = X/Y$ and now $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d \in K$. Evidently

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha_1 = \sigma_1, \ldots, \alpha_m = \sigma_m, & \alpha_{m+1} = 1/\delta_{m+1} \ldots, \alpha_d = 1/\delta_d\ , \\ \beta_1 = \tau_1, \ldots, \beta_n = \tau_n, & \beta_{n+1} = 1/\eta_{n+1} \ldots, \beta_d = 1/\eta_d\ . \end{array}$$

The resultant $\mathrm{Res}(f,g)$ is given by the same determinant (13) as $\mathrm{Res}(F,G)$. Since $a_d, b_d \neq 0$, a well-known formula for the resultant (see [L], Proposition 10.3) gives

$$\mathrm{Res}(f,g) \;=\; (a_d)^d \cdot (b_d)^d \cdot \prod_{i,j=1}^{d} (\alpha_i - \beta_j)\ .$$

Inserting the above values for a_d, b_d and the α_i, β_j, then simplifying, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{Res}(F,G)| \;=\; |\mathrm{Res}(f,g)| \;=\; |C_0|^d \cdot |C_1|^d \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} |\sigma_i - \tau_j| \cdot \prod_{i=m+1}^{d}\prod_{j=1}^{n} |1 - \delta_i \tau_j| \\ \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=n+1}^{d} |\sigma_i \eta_j - 1| \cdot \prod_{i=m+1}^{d}\prod_{j=n+1}^{d} |\eta_j - \delta_i|\ . \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{cases} |\sigma_i - \tau_j| = \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\| & \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m,\ j = 1, \ldots, n; \\ |1 - \delta_i \tau_j| = 1 = \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\| & \text{for } i = m+1, \ldots, d,\ j = 1, \ldots, n; \\ |\sigma_i \eta_j - 1| = 1 = \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\| & \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m,\ j = n+1, \ldots, d; \\ |\eta_j - \delta_i| = \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\| & \text{for } i = m+1, \ldots, d,\ j = n+1, \ldots, d. \end{cases}$$

Thus $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)| = |\mathrm{Res}(F,G)| = |C_0|^d \cdot |C_1|^d \cdot \prod_{i,j=1}^{d} \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\|$. □

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. Then* $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$ *and* $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^d \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. *In particular* $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|^{1/d}$ *and* $B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$.

Proof. Recall that $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$, $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$, $B_0(\varphi)$, and $|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$ are invariant under pre- and post- composition of φ with elements of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$.

To show that $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$, put $R = \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$ and fix $Q \in \varphi^{-1}(\{\zeta_G\})$ with $\mathrm{diam}_G(Q) = R$. Choose $\gamma_1 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ so that $\gamma_1(\zeta_{0,R}) = Q$; after replacing φ with $\varphi \circ \gamma_1$ we can assume that $Q = \zeta_{0,R}$. There are at most d directions $\vec{v} \in T_P$ for which $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v})^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$, since such a direction must contain a solution to $\varphi(\alpha)) = 0$. Similarly, for each $\vec{w} \in T_{\zeta_G}$, there are at most d directions $\vec{v} \in T_Q$ for which $\varphi_*(\vec{v}) = \vec{w}$. Since the map $\varphi_* : T_Q \to T_{\zeta_G}$ is surjective, we can find directions $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in T_Q$ satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in T_Q \backslash \{\vec{v}_\infty\}$;
(2) $\vec{v}_1 \neq \vec{v}_2$ and $\varphi_*(\vec{v}_1) \neq \varphi_*(\vec{v}_2)$;
(3) $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v}_1)^-) = \mathcal{B}_{\zeta_G}(\varphi_*(\vec{v}_1))^-$ and $\varphi(\mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v}_2)^-) = \mathcal{B}_{\zeta_G}(\varphi_*(\vec{v}_2))^-$ are balls.

Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \cap \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v}_1)^-$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \cap \mathcal{B}_Q(\vec{v}_2)^-$, and note that $\|\alpha, \beta\| = R$. Put $A = \varphi(a)$, $B = \varphi(\beta)$.

Since A and B belong to distinct tangent directions at ζ_G, by ([1], Corollary 2.13(B)) there is a $\gamma_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ which takes the triple (A, ζ_G, B) to $(0, \zeta_G, \infty)$. Since $\gamma_2(\zeta_G) = \zeta_G$, and the stabilizer of ζ_G is $K^\times \cdot \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, we can scale γ_2 so that it belongs to $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$. After replacing φ with $\gamma_2 \circ \varphi$, we can assume that $\varphi(\alpha) = 0$ and $\varphi(\beta) = \infty$. By Proposition 4.4

$$\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi) \;=\; R \;=\; \|\alpha, \beta\| \;\geq\; |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)| \;.$$

To show that $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^d \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$, put $r = \mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$ and choose $\gamma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ with $\gamma(\varphi(\zeta_G)) = \zeta_{0,r}$. After replacing φ with $\gamma \circ \varphi$ we can assume that $\varphi(\zeta_G) = \zeta_{0,r}$.

In this setting, if (F, G) is a normalized representation of φ, and notations are as in Proposition 4.4, then $|C_0| = r = \mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)$ and $|C_1| = 1$. From the inequality $B_0(\varphi) \geq \mathrm{RP}(\varphi)$ it follows that $B_0(\varphi) \geq \min_{i,j} \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\|$. Furthermore, $\|\alpha_i, \beta_j\| \leq 1$ for all i, j, and $|\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)| \leq 1$.

Thus, by Proposition 4.4, we have $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^d \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |C_0|^d \cdot \min_{i,j} \|\alpha_i, \beta_j\| \;\geq\; |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. Since $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \leq 1$ and $B_0(\varphi) \leq 1$, the last two inequalities in the Corollary are immediate. □

5. Proofs of Theorems 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3

Our main result is

Theorem 5.1. *Let K be a complete, algebraically closed nonarchimedean field, and let $\varphi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\leq\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \cdot B_0(\varphi)^d}\,, \frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d} \cdot B_0(\varphi)}\Big)\;. \tag{14}$$

This is a restatement of Theorem 0.2 in the Introduction. Before giving the proof of Theorem 5.1, we will make some reductions. Put $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$, and consider a ball $\mathcal{B}(a, B_0)^-$. By the definition of B_0, the image $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(a, B_0)^-)$ is a ball. In particular there is an $\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ with $\alpha \notin \varphi(\mathcal{B}(a, B_0)^-)$. By choosing $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ with $\gamma_1(\alpha) = \infty$, $\gamma_2(0) = a$, and replacing φ with $\Phi = \gamma_1 \circ \varphi \circ \gamma_2$, we can arrange that that $a = 0$ and that $\Phi(D(0, B_0)^-)$ omits ∞.

This means that $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-)$ is a disc $D(c_0,R)^-$, where $\Phi(0)=c_0$. By the Weierstrass Preparation theorem, we can expand $\Phi(z)$ on $D(0,B_0)^-$ in the form

$$\Phi(z) \;=\; c_0 + (c_1 z + c_2 z^2 + \cdots + c_n z^n)\cdot U(z)$$

where $1 \le n \le d$ is the number of solutions to $\Phi(z)=c_0$ in $B(0,B_0)^-$, and $U(z) = 1 + u_1 z + u_2 z^2 + \cdots$ is a unit power series converging on $D(0,B_0)^-$; here $|u_i| \le 1/B_0^i$ for each i.

Put

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; \max_{1\le k\le n} |c_k| r^k \ .$$

By the theory of Newton polygons, for each $r \in |K^\times|$ with $0 < r < B_0$, we have $\Phi(D(a,r)) = D(c_0, f(r))$, so

$$\Phi(\zeta_{0,r}) \;=\; \zeta_{c_0, f_\Phi(r)} \tag{15}$$

By the continuity of the action of Φ on $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, (15) holds for all $r \in [0,B_0]$, and $f_\Phi(B_0) = R$.

We will prove Theorem 5.1 by applying Corollary 2.2, and dealing with five cases: four cases dealing with radial paths $[0,B_0]$ contained in balls $\mathcal{B}(0,B_0)^-$ according as

$$\begin{cases} |c_0| \le 1 \text{ and } f_\Phi(B_0) \le 1 \ , \\ |c_0| \le 1 \text{ and } f_\Phi(B_0) > 1 \ , \\ |c_0| > 1 \text{ and } f_\Phi(B_0) \le |c_0| \ , \\ |c_0| > 1 \text{ and } f_\Phi(B_0) > |c_0| \ , \end{cases}$$

and one case dealing with radial paths $[\xi,\zeta_G]$ in the central ball

$$\mathcal{B}_\rho(\zeta_G, -\log(B_0))^- \;=\; \{x \in \mathbf{P}^1_K : \mathrm{diam}_G(x) \ge B_0\} \ .$$

Case 1 is covered by the following Proposition:

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\Phi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \ge 1$; write $B_0 = B_0(\Phi)$, put $c_0 = \Phi(0)$, and assume Φ has no poles in $D(0,B_0)^-$, so $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-) = D(c_0,R)^-$ is a disc. Suppose $|c_0| \le 1$ and $R \le 1$. Then the restriction of Φ to $[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]$ satisfies*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;\le\; \frac{d}{B_0} \ .$$

Proof. As in Lemma 2.4 we can partition $[0,B_0]$ into subintervals $[r_i, r_{i+1}]$ where $0 = r_1 < \cdots < r_{\ell+1} = B_0$, such that on $[r_{i-1}, r_i]$ we have

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; f_i(r) \;=\; |c_{k(i)}| \cdot r^{k(i)} \ .$$

Write $f'_\Phi(r)$ for the right-derivative of $f_\Phi(r)$ on $[0,B_0)$. By Lemma 2.4, $f'_\Phi(r)$ is non-decreasing. Hence

$$\sup_{r\in[0,B_0)} f'_\Phi(r) \;=\; \lim_{r\to B_0^-} f'_\ell(r) \;=\; k(\ell)\cdot|c_{k(\ell)}|\cdot B_0^{k(\ell)-1} \;=\; \frac{k(\ell)\cdot f_\Phi(B_0)}{B_0} \ . \tag{16}$$

Since $|c_0| \le 1$ and $f_\Phi(B_0) \le 1$, we have $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-) \subset D(0,1)$, so $F_\Phi(r) = f_\Phi(r)$ for all $r \in [0,B_0]$. Using the inequalities $k(\ell) \le n \le d$ and $f_\Phi(B_0) \le 1$ we conclude from (16) that

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,B_0)}\right) \;=\; \sup_{r\in[0,B_0)} f'_\Phi(r) \;\le\; \frac{d}{B_0} \ .$$

□

To deal with Case 2, we will need several lemmas. The first is an elementary maximization bound from Calculus:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $H \geq 1$, and put $g(x) = x \cdot H^{1/x}$ for $x > 0$. Then for each closed interval $[a,b] \subset (0,\infty)$,*

$$\max_{x\in[a,b]} g(x) \;=\; \max\big(g(a), g(b)\big)\ .$$

Proof. If $H = 1$ then $g(x) = x$ and the result is trivial. If $H > 1$, then $g'(x) = (1 - \ln(H)/x)\cdot H^{1/x}$ and $g''(x) = (\ln(H))^2/x^3 \cdot H^{1/x}$, so $g(x)$ is convex up for $x > 0$, and its unique minimum is at $x = \ln(H)$. Thus the maximum value of $g(x)$ on $[a,b]$ is achieved at an endpoint. □

The second is a bound for $\lim_{|z|\to 1^-} |\Phi(z)|$. Recall that if P, Q are distinct points in $\mathbf{P}^1_K$, the annulus $\mathrm{Ann}(P,Q)$ is the component of $\mathbf{P}^1_K \setminus \{P,Q\}$ containing (P,Q).

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\Phi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 2$; write $B_0 = B_0(\Phi)$. If $\Phi(\zeta_G) = \zeta_{a,R}$, then*

$$\lim_{\substack{|z|\to 1^-\\ z\in K}} |\Phi(z)| \;=\; \max(|a|, R)\ . \tag{17}$$

Proof. Let $\vec{v}_0 \in T_{\zeta_G}$ be the tangent direction towards 0, and put $\vec{w} = \Phi_*(\vec{v}_0) \in T_{\zeta_{a,R}}$. Fix a point $b \in B_{\zeta_{a,R}}(\vec{w})^- \cap \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. By ([1], Corollary 9.21 and Lemma 9.45), there are points $X \in (\zeta_G, 0)$, $Y \in (\zeta_{a,R}, b)$ such that Φ maps $[\zeta_G, X]$ homeomorphically onto $[\zeta_{a,R}, Y]$, and for each $x \in [\zeta_G, X]$, Φ maps $\mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x)$ onto $\mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_{a,R}, \Phi(x))$. Put $r = \mathrm{diam}_\infty(x)$, $S = \mathrm{diam}_\infty(\Phi(x))$. When $r \to 1^-$, then $\Phi(x) \to \zeta_{a,R}$ and $S \to R$. Note that

$$K \cap \mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x) \;=\; \{z \in K : r < |z| < 1\}\ .$$

Consider the possibilities for $\Phi\big(K \cap \mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x)\big)$. If $|a| \leq R$, then $\zeta_{a,R} = \zeta_{0,R}$. In this situation, if $\vec{w} \in T_{\zeta_{0,R}}$ points towards 0, then for r near enough 1, $\Phi\big(K \cap \mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x)\big) = \{z \in K : S < |z| < R\}$. If $\vec{w}$ points towards ∞, then for r near enough 1, $\Phi\big(K \cap \mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x)\big) = \{z \in K : R < |z| < S\}$. Otherwise, $\Phi\big(K \cap \mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x)\big) \subset D(b,R)^- \subset \{z \in K : |z| = R\}$. In any case,

$$\lim_{\substack{|z|\to 1^-\\ z\in K}} |\Phi(z)| \;=\; R \;=\; \max(|a|, R)\ .$$

If $|a| > R$, put $R_0 = |\,a|$. Regardless of the direction $\vec{w}$, when r is close enough to 1 we will have $\Phi\big(K \cap \mathrm{Ann}(\zeta_G, x)\big) \subset D(a, R_0)^- \subset \{z \in K : |z| = |a|\}$. Thus

$$\lim_{\substack{|z|\to 1^-\\ z\in K}} |\Phi(z)| \;=\; |a| \;=\; \max(|a|, R)\ .$$

Hence (17) holds in all cases. □

The third is a bound for $f_\Phi(B_0)$:

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\Phi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 2$; write $B_0 = B_0(\Phi)$. Assume that $\Phi(0) = 0$, and that Φ has no poles in $D(0,B_0)^-$, so $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-) = D(0, f_\Phi(B_0))^-$ is a disc, and $f_\Phi(r) = \mathrm{diam}_\infty\big(\Phi(\zeta_{0,r})\big)$ is increasing for $0 \leq r \leq B_0$. Suppose Φ has $n \geq 1$*

zeros in $D(0,B_0)^-$*, and* $m \geq 0$ *poles in* $D(0,1)^-\backslash D(0,B_0)^-$ (*counting multiplicities*). *Then*

$$f_\Phi(B_0) \;\leq\; \frac{B_0^{n-m}}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)}\,.$$

Proof. Since $\Phi(0)=0$ and Φ has no poles in $D(0,B_0)^-$, for each $0<r\leq B_0$, $\Phi(D(0,r)^-)$ is a disc $D(0,f_\Phi(r))^-$; clearly $f_\Phi(r)$ is increasing with r.

We can write

$$\Phi(z) \;=\; C\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=1}^N(z-\alpha_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^M(z-\beta_j)} \tag{18}$$

where $C\neq 0$ is a constant, $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_N$ are the zeros of Φ in K (listed with multiplicity), and $\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_M$ are the poles of Φ in K (listed with multiplicity). Since $\deg(\Phi)=d$, $\max(N,M)=d$. Without loss, we can assume that $0=|\alpha_1|\leq|\alpha_2|\leq\cdots\leq|\alpha_N|$.

Since Φ has n zeros in $D(0,B_0)^-$ and $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-)=D(0,f_\Phi(B_0))^-$, (18) gives

$$f_\Phi(B_0) \;=\; \lim_{|z|\to B_0^-}|\Phi(z)| \;=\; |C|\cdot\frac{B_0^n\cdot\prod_{i=n+1}^N\max(B_0,|\alpha_i|)}{\prod_{j=1}^M\max(B_0,|\beta_j|)}\,. \tag{19}$$

Also, writing $\Phi(\zeta_G)=\zeta_{a,R}$, by Lemma 5.4 and formula (11) we have

$$\lim_{\substack{|z|\to 1^-\\ z\in K}}|\Phi(z)| \;=\; \max(|a|,R) \;\leq\; \frac{\max(1,|a|,R)^2}{R} \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)}\,. \tag{20}$$

Using (18) to evaluate $\lim_{|z|\to 1^-}|\Phi(z)|$ in (20), we see that

$$|C|\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=1}^M\max(1,|\alpha_i|)}{\prod_{j=1}^N\max(1,|\beta_j|)} \;\leq\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)}\,. \tag{21}$$

Using (21) to eliminate $|C|$ in (19), and recalling that Φ has no poles in $B(0,B_0)^-$ and m poles in $B(0,1)^-\backslash B(0,B_0)^-$, we obtain

$$f_\Phi(B_0) \;\leq\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)}\cdot\frac{B_0^n\cdot\prod_{B_0\leq|\alpha_i|<1}|\alpha_i|}{\prod_{B_0\leq|\beta_j|<1}|\beta_j|} \;\leq\; \frac{B_0^{n-m}}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)}\,.$$

□

Case 2 is covered by the following Proposition:

Proposition 5.6. *Let* $\Phi(z)\in K(z)$ *have degree* $d\geq 1$*; write* $B_0=B_0(\Phi)$*, and put* $c_0=\Phi(0)$*. Assume* Φ *has no poles in* $D(0,B_0)^-$*, so* $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-)=D(c_0,R)^-$ *is a disc. Suppose* $|c_0|\leq 1$ *and* $R>1$*. Then the restriction of* Φ *to* $[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]$ *satisfies*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;\leq\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)\cdot B_0^d},\frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)^{1/d}\cdot B_0}\Big)\,. \tag{22}$$

Proof. Since $\gamma_{c_0}(z):=z-c_0\in\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, after replacing $\Phi(z)$ with $\gamma_{c_0}\circ\Phi(z)=\Phi(z)-c_0$, we can assume that $\Phi(0)=0$. By the Weierstrass Preparation theorem, we can expand $\Phi(z)$ in $D(0,B_0)^-$ as

$$\Phi(z) \;=\; (c_1z+\cdots+c_nz^n)\cdot U(z)$$

where $U(z)$ is a unit power series. Hence

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; \max_{1\le k\le n}\left(|c_k|r^k\right), \qquad F_\Phi(r) \;=\; \begin{cases} f_\Phi(r) & \text{if } f_\Phi(r)\le 1 \\ 1/f_\Phi(r) & \text{if } f_\Phi(r)\ge 1 \end{cases}.$$

By Lemma 2.4, there is a partition $0=r_1<\cdots<r_{\ell+1}=B_0$ of $[0,B_0]$ such that for each subinterval $[r_i,r_{i+1}]$ there is an index $k(i)$ for which $f_\Phi(r)=|c_{k(i)}|r^{k(i)}$. After inserting an extra partition point if necessary, we can assume there is an i_0 for which $f_\Phi(r_{i_0})=1$. The right-derivative $f'_\Phi(r)$ is non-decreasing on $[0,B_0]$, and $k(i-1)\le k(i)$ for each $i=2,\dots,\ell$.

We will now bound the absolute value of the right-derivative $F'_\Phi(r)$ on $[0,B_0)$. Since $F_\Phi(r)=f_\Phi(r)$ on $[0,r_{i_0})$,

$$\sup_{r\in[0,r_{i_0})}|F'_\Phi(r)| \;=\; \lim_{r\to r_{i_0}^-} f'_\Phi(r) \;\le\; f'_\Phi(r_{i_0}) \;=\; \frac{k(i_0)}{r_{i_0}}.$$

For each $i\ge i_0$, on the interval $[r_i,r_{i+1})$

$$|F'_\Phi(r)| \;=\; \left|-\frac{f'_\Phi(r)}{f_\Phi(r)^2}\right| \;=\; \frac{k(i)}{r}\cdot\frac{1}{f_\Phi(r)} \;\le\; \frac{k(i)}{r_i\cdot f_\Phi(r_i)} \;\le\; \frac{k(i)}{r_i}.$$

Thus by Corollary 2.3,

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi|_{[0,B_0]}) \;=\; \sup_{r\in[0,B_0)}|F'_\Phi(r)| \;=\; \max_{i_0\le i\le\ell}\frac{k(i)}{r_i f_\Phi(r_i)} \tag{23}$$

$$\le\; \max_{i_0\le i\le\ell}\frac{k(i)}{r_i}. \tag{24}$$

Here the second and third expressions in (23) are equal by the right-continuity of $f'_\Phi(r)$.

For each $k=1,\dots,n$ with $c_k\neq 0$, let $u_k>0$ be the unique solution to $|c_k|r^k=1$. For brevity, write $G_0=\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)$. By the nonarchimedean Maximum Modulus principle and Lemma 5.5, we have $|c_k|B_0^k\le f_\Phi(B_0)\le B_0^{n-m}/G_0$, where n is the number of zeros of Φ in $D(0,B_0)^-$ and m is the number of poles of Φ in $D(0,1)^-\backslash D(0,B_0)^-$. Hence $|c_k|\le B_0^{n-m-k}/G_0$, so $1=|c_k|(u_k)^k\le B_0^{n-m-k}\cdot(u_k)^k/G_0$, and

$$\frac{1}{u_k} \;\le\; B_0^{-1}\cdot\Big(\frac{B_0^{n-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/k}. \tag{25}$$

For each $i\ge i_0$, we have $u_{k(i)}\le r_i$. Using Corollary 2.3 and (24), (25), we see that

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;=\; \sup_{r\in[0,B_0)}|F'_\Phi(r)| \;\le\; \max_{i_0\le i\le\ell}\frac{k(i)}{r_i} \;\le\; \max_{i_0\le i\le\ell}k(i)\cdot B_0^{-1}\cdot\Big(\frac{B_0^{n-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/k(i)}$$

$$\le\; B_0^{-1}\cdot\max_{1\le k\le n}k\cdot\Big(\frac{B_0^{n-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/k}. \tag{26}$$

However, we want a bound for $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right)$ independent of n and m. By the discussion above $1\le k\le n\le d$ and $0\le m\le d$. We need only consider pairs (n,m) for which $B_0^{n-m}/G_0>1$, since by assumption $1<f_\Phi(B_0)$ and Lemma 5.5 gives $f_\Phi(B_0)\le B_0^{n-m}/G_0$. Letting (k,n,m) range over all triples of integers satisfying these

conditions we see that

$$\text{(27)}\qquad \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;\le\; \max_{\substack{0\le m\le d\\ 1\le n\le d\\ B_0^{n-m}/G_0>1}} \Big(B_0^{-1}\cdot \max_{1\le k\le n} k\cdot\Big(\frac{B_0^{n-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/k}\Big)\,.$$

We will now bound the right side of (27). Fixing n and m with $B_0^{n-m}/G_0>1$, and taking $H=B_0^{n-m}/G_0$ in Lemma 5.3, shows that

$$B_0^{-1}\cdot \max_{1\le k\le n} k\cdot\Big(\frac{B_0^{n-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/k} \;=\; \max\Big(\frac{B_0^{n-m-1}}{G_0}, n\Big(\frac{B_0^{-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/n}\Big)\,.$$

Inserting this in (27), interchanging the order of the maxima, and dropping the condition $B_0^{n-m}/G_0>1$ gives

$$\text{(28)}\qquad \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;\le\; \max\Big(\max_{\substack{0\le m\le d\\ 1\le n\le d}}\frac{B_0^{n-m-1}}{G_0}, \max_{\substack{0\le m\le d\\ 1\le n\le d}} n\Big(\frac{B_0^{-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/n}\Big)\,.$$

The first inner maximum in (28) is B_0^{-d}/G_0, achieved when $n=1$ and $m=d$. For the second inner maximum, fixing m and taking $H=B_0^{-m}/G_0$ in Lemma 5.3 gives

$$\max_{1\le n\le d} n\Big(\frac{B_0^{-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/n} \;=\; \max\Big(\frac{B_0^{-m}}{G_0}\,, d\Big(\frac{B_0^{-m}}{G_0}\Big)^{1/d}\Big)$$

The maximum of this for $0\le m\le d$ is attained when $m=d$, and is

$$\max\Big(\frac{1}{G_0\cdot B_0^d}\,, \frac{d}{G_0^{1/d}\cdot B_0}\Big)$$

Combining these results gives (22). □

Case 3 is covered by the following result:

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\Phi(z)\in K(z)$ have degree $d\ge 1$; write $B_0=B_0(\Phi)$, put $c_0=\Phi(0)$, and assume that $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-)=D(c_0,R)^-$. Suppose $|c_0|>1$ and $R\le|c_0|$. Then the restriction of Φ to $[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]$ satisfies*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;\le\; \frac{d}{B_0}\,.$$

Proof. Partition $[0,B_0]$ by taking $0=r_1<\cdots<r_{\ell+1}=B_0$ so that

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; f_i(r) \;:=\; |c_{k(i)}|\cdot r^{k(i)}$$

on $[r_i,r_{i+1})$. Write $f'_\Phi(r)$ for the right-derivative of $f_\Phi(r)$. Just as in Proposition 5.2,

$$\text{(29)}\qquad \sup_{r\in[0,B_0)} f'_\Phi(r) \;=\; \lim_{r\to B_0^-} f'_\ell(r) \;=\; k(\ell)\cdot|c_{k(\ell)}|\cdot B_0^{k(\ell)-1} \;=\; \frac{k(\ell)\cdot f_\Phi(B_0)}{B_0}\,.$$

Since $|c_0|>1$ and $f_\Phi(B_0)\le|c_0|$, we have $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-)\subset D(c_0,|c_0|)^-$, hence $F_\Phi(r)=f_\Phi(r)/|c_0|$ and $F'_\Phi(r)=f'_\Phi(r)/|c_0|$ for all $r\in[0,B_0)$. Using that $k(\ell)\le n\le d$ and $f_\Phi(B_0)\le|c_0|$ we conclude from (29) that

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,B_0)}\right) \;=\; \sup_{r\in[0,B_0)} F'_\Phi(r) \;\le\; \frac{d}{B_0}\,.$$

□

Case 4 reduces to Case 2 by a trick:

Proposition 5.8. *Let $\Phi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \geq 1$; write $B_0 = B_0(\Phi)$, put $c_0 = \Phi(0)$, and assume $\Phi(D(0,B_0)^-) = D(c_0,R)^-$. Suppose $|c_0| > 1$ and $R > |c_0|$. Then the restriction of Φ to $[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]$ satisfies*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]}\right) \;\leq\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)\cdot B_0^d}, \frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)^{1/d}\cdot B_0}\Big)\ .$$

Proof. Since $f_\Phi(r)$ is continuous and monotonic, with $f_\Phi(0) = 0$ and $f_\Phi(B_0) > |c_0| > 1$, there is a unique $0 < R < B_0$ with $f_\Phi(R) = |c_0|$. For this R, the theory of Newton polygons shows that $\Phi(D(0,R)) = D(c_0,|c_0|) = D(0,|c_0|)$, so there is an $\alpha \in D(0,R)$ for which $\Phi(\alpha) = 0$. Write $\gamma_\alpha(z) = z + \alpha \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, and put

$$\Psi(z) \;=\; \Phi(z+\alpha) \;=\; (\Phi\circ\gamma_\alpha)(z)\ .$$

By construction $\Psi(0) = 0$, so Ψ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 5.6. Since $\gamma_\alpha(z) \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ we have $\mathrm{GIR}(\Psi) = \mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)$ and $B_0(\Psi) = B_0(\Phi) = B_0$.

We will prove Proposition 5.8 by showing that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi_{[0,B_0]}) \leq \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Psi_{[0,B_0]})$ and applying Proposition 5.6 to Ψ.

For each r with $R < r < B_0$, we have $\Psi(\mathcal{D}(0,r)^-) = \Phi(\mathcal{D}(0,r)^-)$, so $f_\Psi(r) = f_\Phi(r)$ for $R \leq r \leq B_0$. As usual, we can write $\Phi(z) = c_0 + (c_1 z + \cdots + c_n z^n)\cdot U(z)$, where $U(z)$ is a unit power series converging on $\mathcal{D}(0,B_0)^-$; then

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; \max_{1\leq k\leq n} |c_k| r^k$$

for each $r \in [0,B_0]$. Likewise we can write $\Psi(z) = (C_1 z + \cdots + C_N z^N)\cdot W(z)$, where $W(z)$ is a unit power series converging on $D(0,B_0)^-$; and

$$f_\Psi(r) \;=\; \max_{1\leq k\leq N} |C_k| r^k$$

for each $r \in [0,B_0]$.

Partition $[0,B_0]$ simultaneously for Φ and Ψ, choosing $0 = r_1 < \cdots < r_{\ell+1} = B_0$ so that for each $i = 1,\ldots,\ell$ there are indices $1 \leq j(i) \leq n$, $1 \leq k(i) \leq N$ such that on $[r_i, r_{i+1})$ we have

$$f_\Phi(r) \;=\; |c_{j(i)}|\cdot r^{j(i)}\ , \qquad f_\Psi(r) \;=\; |C_{k(i)}|\cdot r^{k(i)}\ .$$

After refining the partition if necessary, we can assume there are indices i_0, i_1 such that $f_\Psi(r_{i_0}) = 1$ and $f_\Psi(r_{i_1}) = f_\Phi(r_{i_1}) = |c_0|$ (evidently $r_{i_1} = R$). Clearly $i_0 < i_1$, since f_Ψ is monotonic.

We claim that $j(i) = k(i)$ for $i = i_1, \cdots, \ell$. To see this, note first that for each r with $r_{i_1} \leq r \leq B_0$, we have $f_\Phi(r) = f_\Psi(r)$. For each $r \in |K^\times|$ with $r_i < r < r_{i+1}$, and each $w \in K$ with $|w| \leq f_\Psi(r)$, the theory of Newton polygons shows that $\Phi(z) = w$ has $j(i)$ solutions in $D(0,r)$, counting multiplicities. Similarly $\Psi(z) = w$ has $k(i)$ solutions in $D(0,r)$ counting multiplicities. But $\Phi(z) = w$ if and only if $\Psi(z-\alpha) = w$. Since $|\alpha| = r_{i_1} \leq r$, we have $|z-\alpha| \leq r$ if and only if $|z| \leq r$. Hence $j(i) = k(i)$.

We have

$$F_\Phi(r) \;=\; \begin{cases} f_\Phi(r)/|c_0|^2 & \text{if } r \in [0, r_{i_1})\ , \\ 1/f_\Phi(r) & \text{if } r \in [r_{i_1}, B_0)\ , \end{cases}$$

and

$$F_\Psi(r) \;=\; \begin{cases} f_\Psi(r) & \text{if } r \in [0, r_{i_0}) \\ 1/f_\Psi(r) & \text{if } r \in [r_{i_0}, B_0) \end{cases} .$$

Write $f'_\Phi(r)$ for the right-derivative of $f_\Phi(r)$ on $[0, B_0)$, and $F'_\Phi(r)$ for the right-derivative of $F_\Phi(r)$. Noting that $|c_0| = f_\Phi(r_{i_1}) = |c_{k(i_1)}|(r_{i_1})^{j(i_1)}$ and recalling from Lemma 2.4 that $f'_\Phi(r)$ is non-decreasing with r, we see that

$$\sup_{r\in[0,r_{i_1})} |F'_\Phi(r)| \;\le\; \frac{f'_\Phi(r_{i_1})}{|c_0|^2} \;=\; \frac{k(i_1)|c_{j(i_1)}|(r_{i_1})^{j(i_1)-1}}{|c_0|^2} \;=\; \frac{j(i_1)}{r_{i_1} f_\Phi(r_{i_1})} .$$

For each $i = i_1, \cdots, \ell$, on $[r_i, r_{i+1})$ we have $F'_\Phi(r) = -f'_\varphi(r)/(f_\varphi(r))^2$, so

$$\sup_{r\in[r_i,r_{i+1})} |F'_\Phi(r)| \;= |F'_\Phi(r_i)| \;=\; \left|\frac{-f'_\Phi(r_i)}{(f_\Phi(r_i))^2}\right| \;=\; \frac{j(i)}{r_i f_\Phi(r_i)} .$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi|_{[0,B_0]}) \;=\; \sup_{r\in[0,B_0)} |F'_\Phi(r)| \;=\; \max_{i_1\le i\le \ell} \Big(\frac{j(i)}{r_i f_\Phi(r_i)}\Big) .$$

Since $i_0 \le i_1$, and $k(i) = j(i)$ and $f_\Phi(r_i) = f_\Psi(r_i)$ for each $i \ge i_1$, by applying (23) with Φ replaced by Ψ and then using the bound for $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Psi|_{[0,B_0]})$ from Proposition 5.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi|_{[0,B_0]}) \;&=\; \max_{i_1\le i\le \ell} \Big(\frac{j(i)}{r_i f_\Phi(r_i)}\Big) \;\le\; \max_{i_0\le i\le \ell} \Big(\frac{k(i)}{r_i f_\Psi(r_i)}\Big) \\ &=\; \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Psi|_{[0,B_0]}) \;\le\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)\cdot B_0^d} , \frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\Phi)^{1/d}\cdot B_0} \Big) . \end{aligned}$$

□

Case 5 (the central ball) is dealt with by the following Proposition:

Proposition 5.9. *Let $\Phi(z) \in K(z)$ have degree $d \ge 1$; write $B_0 = B_0(\Phi)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[\zeta_{0,B_0},\zeta_G]}\right) \;\le\; \frac{d}{B_0} .$$

Proof. We use the fact that in the ρ-metric, along a given segment Φ locally scales distances by an integer $1 \le m \le d$. To obtain the Lipschitz bound for the d-metric, we conjugate this between the d- and ρ-metrics. Fix a base $q > 1$ such that for each $0 < r \le 1$ we have $\rho(\zeta_G, \zeta_{0,r}) = -\log_q(r)$, and put $E(z) = q^z$, $L(r) = \log_q(r)$. Define $F_\Phi : (B_0, 1] \to (0, 1]$ by

$$F_\Phi(r) \;=\; \mathrm{diam}_G\left(\Phi(\zeta_{0,r})\right) .$$

Note that $\zeta_G = \zeta_{0,1}$. Choose a partition $B_0 = r_1 < \cdots < r_{\ell+1} = 1$ of $[B_0, 1]$ such that on each subinterval $[r_i, r_{i+1}]$, Φ has the following properties:

(1) Φ maps the segment $[\zeta_{0,r_i}, \zeta_{0,r_{i_1}}]$ homeomorphically onto some radial segment;
(2) there is an integer $1 \le m_i \le d$ such that $\deg_\Phi(P) = m_i$ for all $P \in (\zeta_{0,r_i}, \zeta_{0,r_{i+1}})$.

To prove the Proposition it suffices to show that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}\left(\Phi|_{[\zeta_{0,r_i},\zeta_{0,r_{i+1}}]}\right) \le d/B_0$ for each i.

Fix i. By (1) and (2) there is an affine function $M_i(y) = a_i y + b_i$, where $a_i = \pm m_i$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\rho(\zeta_G, \Phi(\zeta_{0,r})) = M_i(L(r))$. Hence for each $r \in [r_i, r_{i+1}]$,

$$F_\Phi(r) \;=\; E \circ M_i \circ L(r)\ .$$

In particular, F_Φ is differentiable on (r_i, r_{i+1}). By the Mean Value Theorem, for each r, s with $r_i \le r < s \le r_{i+1}$ there is an $r_* \in (r, s)$ such that

$$\frac{d(\Phi(\zeta_{0,r}), \Phi(\zeta_{0,s}))}{d(\zeta_{0,r}, \zeta_{0,s})} \;=\; \left|\frac{F_\Phi(r) - F_\Phi(s)}{r - s}\right| \;=\; |F_\Phi'(r_*)|\ ,$$

so it will be enough to show that $|F_\Phi'(r)| \le d/B_0$ on (r_i, r_{i+1}). However, this follows easily from the Chain rule: for each $r \in (r_i, r_{i+1})$

$$|F_\Phi'(r)| \;=\; \big(q^{M_i(L(r))} \cdot \ln(q)\big) \cdot |a_i| \cdot \frac{1}{r \cdot \ln(q)} \;=\; F_\Phi(r) \cdot \frac{m_i}{r} \;\le\; \frac{m_i}{r_i} \;\le\; \frac{d}{B_0}\ .$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By Corollary 2.2, it suffices to show that for each radial segment I of the form $[\alpha, \xi]$ or $[\xi, \zeta_G]$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and $\mathrm{diam}_G(\xi) = B_0(\varphi)$, one has

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_I) \;\le\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \cdot B_0(\varphi)^d}\,, \frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d} \cdot B_0(\varphi)}\Big)\ . \tag{30}$$

First suppose $I = [\alpha, \xi]$. By the definition of the ball-mapping radius $B_0 = B_0(\varphi)$, $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(\alpha, B_0)^-)$ is a ball, and hence omits some $\beta \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Take any $\gamma_1 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ with $\gamma_2(\beta) = \infty$, and take any $\gamma_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ with $\gamma_2(0) = \alpha$. Put $\Phi = \gamma_1 \circ \varphi \circ \gamma_2$. Then $[\alpha, \xi] = \gamma_2([0, \zeta_{0,B_0}])$, $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[\alpha,\xi]}) = \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi|_{[0,\zeta_{0,B_0}]})$, and $\Phi(\mathcal{D}(0, B_0)^-)$ is a disc $\mathcal{D}(c_0, R)^-$ for some $c_0 \in K$ and some $0 < R < \infty$. Propositions 5.2, 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8 cover all possibilities for $|c_0|$ and R, and they show that (30) holds.

Next suppose $I = [\xi, \zeta_G]$. Take any type II point $\xi_0 \in (\xi, \zeta_G)$, and let $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ be such that $\xi_0 \in [\alpha_0, \zeta_G]$. Choose any $\gamma_2 \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ with $\gamma_2(0) = \alpha_0$; then $[\xi_0, \zeta_G] \subset \gamma_2([\zeta_{0,B_0}, \zeta_G])$. Put $\Phi = \varphi \circ \gamma_2$. Then $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[\xi_0,\zeta_G]}) \le \mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi|_{[\zeta_{0,B_0},\zeta_G]})$, and Proposition 5.9 shows that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\Phi|_{[\zeta_{0,B_0},\zeta_G]})$ satisfies (30). Since we can choose ξ_0 as close to ξ as desired, $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi|_{[\xi,\zeta_G]})$ satisfies (30) as well. □

Proof of Theorem 0.3. Given φ, we first show that

$$\sup_{\substack{x,y \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \\ x \ne y}} \frac{\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\|}{\|x, y\|} \;\le\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)}\ . \tag{31}$$

Fix $x, y \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ with $x \ne y$. We claim that $\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\|/\|x, y\| \le 1/\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$. If $\|x, y\| \ge \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$, the inequality is trivial since $\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\| \le 1$. Suppose $\|x, y\| < \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$. After pre-composing and post-composing φ with suitable elements of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, we can assume that $y = 0$ and $\varphi(y) = 0$. Put $R = \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$. By the definition of $\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$, the image $\varphi(\mathcal{D}(0, R)^-)$ omits ζ_G. In particular, φ has no poles in $D(0, R)^-$ and $|\varphi(z)| < 1$ for all $z \in D(0, R)^-$. Thus we can expand $\varphi(z)$ as a power series converging in $D(0, R)^-$,

$$\varphi(z) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i z^i\ ,$$

where $c_0 = 0$ and $|c_i| \leq 1/R^i$ for $i \geq 1$. Note that $\|x, y\| = |x - 0| = |x|$, and that

$$\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\| \;=\; |\varphi(x) - 0| \;=\; |\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i x^i| \;\leq\; \max_{i\geq 1}(|x|/R)^i \;=\; |x|/R\ .$$

It follows that $\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\|/\|x, y\| \leq 1/R = 1/\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$.

To complete the proof, we will show that there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ with

$$\frac{\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\|}{\|x, y\|} \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)}\ .$$

Let $Q \in \varphi^{-1}(\zeta_G)$ be a point (necessarily of type II) for which $\mathrm{diam}_G(Q) = \mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$. After post-composing φ with a suitable element of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$, we can assume $Q = \zeta_{0,R}$; by construction, $\varphi(Q) = \zeta_G$. Consider the tangent space T_Q. For any $\vec{w} \in T_{\zeta_G}$, there are at most d directions $\vec{v} \in T_Q$ with $\varphi_*(\vec{v}) = \vec{w}$. Also, there are only finitely many directions $\vec{v} \in T_Q$ for which $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(Q, \vec{v})^-) = \mathbf{P}^1_K$. Hence, we can choose $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \in T_Q \backslash \{\vec{v}_\infty\}$ with $\varphi_*(\vec{v}_1) \neq \varphi_*(\vec{v}_2)$, such that $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(Q, \vec{v}_1)^-)$ and $\varphi(\mathcal{B}(Q, \vec{v}_2)^-)$ are balls. Take any $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \cap \mathcal{B}(Q, \vec{v}_1)^-$, $y \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) \cap \mathcal{B}(Q, \vec{v}_2)^-$. Then $\|x, y\| = R$ and $\|\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\| = 1$. □

Proof of Theorem 0.1. In Theorem 0.3 we have shown that $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \leq 1/\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)$. It follows from Corollary 4.5 that $1/|\mathrm{GPR}(\varphi)| \leq 1/|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$, so $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}(\varphi) \leq 1/|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$.

In Theorem 0.2 we have shown that

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\leq\; \max\Big(\frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d} \cdot B_0(\varphi)}, \frac{1}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \cdot B_0(\varphi)^d}\Big)\ . \tag{32}$$

By Corollary 4.5 we have $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^d \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. Since $1 \geq \mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) > 0$ it follows that $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d} \geq \mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^d$, which yields $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d} \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$. Similarly $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \cdot B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$ and $B_0(\varphi) \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|$, so $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) \cdot B_0(\varphi)^d \geq |\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|^d$. Thus $\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\leq\; \max\big(d/|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|, 1/|\mathrm{Res}(\varphi)|^d\big)$. □

6. Examples

An analysis of the proof of Theorem 5.1 leads to the following examples, which show the bound (14) in Theorem 5.1 is nearly optimal.

Example 1. Let $2 \leq d \in \mathbb{Z}$, and fix $S \in |K^\times|$ with $0 < S \leq 1$. Choose $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_d \in K$ with $|\beta_i| = S$ for all i and $|\beta_i - \beta_j| = S$ for all $i \neq j$. Fix an integer $1 \leq k \leq d-1$ and a constant $C \in K$ with $|C| \geq 1$, and put

$$\varphi(z) \;=\; \frac{Cz^k}{(z - \beta_1) \cdots (z - \beta_d)}\ .$$

One sees easily that $\varphi(\zeta_G) = \zeta_{0,|C|}$, so $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) = 1/|C|$. Using the theory of Newton polygons, one sees that for each $a \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, the image of $B(a, S)^-$ omits at least one point of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and that $\varphi(\mathcal{D}(0, S)^-) = \mathcal{D}(0, |C|/S^d)^-$ but $\varphi(\mathcal{D}(0, S)) = \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Thus $B_0(\varphi) = S$. For $0 \leq r \leq S$ one has

$$f_\varphi(r) \;:=\; \mathrm{diam}_\infty(\varphi(\zeta_{0,r})) \;=\; |C|r^k/S^d\ .$$

Put $r_1 = (S^d/|C|)^{1/k} \leq S$; then $f_\varphi(r_1) = 1$, and

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\geq\; f'_\varphi(r_1) \;=\; k \cdot |C| r_1^{k-1} \;=\; \frac{k}{r_1} \;=\; \frac{k}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/k} \cdot B_0(\varphi)^{d/k}}\ .$$

Taking $k = 1$, one sees that the first term in (14) cannot be improved. Taking $k = d-1$, one obtains a quantity which differs from the second term $d/\big(\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d} \cdot B_0(\varphi)\big)$ by a factor Δ satisfying $(d-1)/d < \Delta < 1$.

Example 2. With d, S, C and the β_i as in Example 1, put

$$\varphi(z) \;=\; \frac{Cz^d}{(z-\beta_1)\cdots(z-\beta_{d-1})}\ .$$

As before, one has $\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi) = 1/|C|$ and $B_0(\varphi) = S$. For $0 \le r \le S$ one has

$$f_\varphi(r) \;:=\; \mathrm{diam}_\infty(\varphi(\zeta_{0,r})) \;=\; |C|r^d/S^{d-1}\ .$$

Put $r_1 = (S^{d-1}/|C|)^{1/d} \le S$; then $f_\varphi(r_1) = 1$, and

$$\mathrm{Lip}_{\mathrm{Berk}}(\varphi) \;\ge\; f'_\varphi(r_1) \;=\; d\cdot|C|r_1^{d-1} \;=\; \frac{d}{r_1} \;=\; \frac{d}{\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d}\cdot B_0(\varphi)^{(d-1)/d}}\ ,$$

which differs from $d/\big(\mathrm{GIR}(\varphi)^{1/d}\cdot B_0(\varphi)\big)$ by the factor $\Delta = B_0(\varphi)^{1/d}$.

Thus the second term in (14) cannot be greatly improved, and when $B_0(\varphi) = 1$ it is sharp.

References

[1] M. Baker and R. Rumely, Potential Theory and Dynamics on the Berkovich Projective Line, AMS Surveys and Monographs 159, Providence, 2010.

[2] R. L. Benedetto, P. Ingram, R. Jones, and A. Levy, *Critical orbits and attracting cycles in p-adic dynamics*, Online preprint arXiv:12011605v2 (September 2012).

[3] V. G. Berkovich, Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 33, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.

[4] X. Faber, *Topology and Geometry of the Berkovich Ramification Locus I, II*, Online preprints arXiv:1102:1432 and arXiv:1104:0943 (May 2011). I: to appear in Manuscripta Math.; II: to appear in Math. Annalen.

[5] C. Favre and J. Rivera-Letelier, *Equidistribution des points de petite hauteur*, Math. Ann. 335(2), 2006, 311-361;. Online preprint arXiv:math/0407471.

[6] C. Favre and J. Rivera-Letelier, em Théorie ergodique des fractions rationelles sur un corps ultramétrique, Proc. London Math. Soc. 100(1) (2010), 116-154.

[7] S. Lang, Algebra (2nd edition), Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1984.

[8] J. Rivera-Letelier, *Espace hyperbolique p-adique et dynamique des fonctions rationelles*, Compositio Math. 138(2) (2003), 199-231.

[9] J. Rivera-Letelier, *Pointes périodiques des fonctions rationelles dans l'esoace hyperbolique p-adique*, Comment. Math. Helv., (2005), 80(3):593629.

[10] R. Rumely, *The Minimal Resultant Locus*, Online preprint arXiv:1304.1201 (April 2013).

[11] R. Rumely, *The Geometry of the Minimal Resultant Locus*, Online preprint arXiv:1402.6017 (February 2014).

[12] R. Rumely, *A New Equivariant in Nonarchimedean Dynamics*, submitted to the Duke Mathematical Journal.

[13] J. Silverman, The Arithmetic of Dynamical Systems, GTM 241, Springer-Verlag, New York 2007.

Robert Rumely, Department of Mathematics, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602, USA

E-mail address: rr@math.uga.edu

Stephen Winburn, Ally Corporation, 440 S. Church Street, Charlotte, N.C. 28202, USA

E-mail address: Stephen.Winburn@ally.com